Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

28th CPSU Congress

FBIS-SOV-90-131-S
Monday
9 July 1990

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
28th CPSU Congress

FBIS-SOV-90-131-S CONTENTS *9 July 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

28th CPSU Congress

- Moscow TV Reports 6 July Congress Proceedings ... 1
  - Morning Session ... 1
  - Report on Evening Session ... 2
  - Luchinskiy Speech ... 3
  - Latvia's Rubiks ... 3
  - Kirghiz Secretary Masaliyev ... 4
  - Tajik First Secretary Makhkamov ... 5
  - Ulyanov Speech ... 6
  - Armenia's Movsesyan ... 7
  - Turkmenistan First Secretary Niyazov ... 7
  - Komsomol First Secretary Zyukin ... 8
  - Irkutsk Oblast Secretary Potapov ... 9
  - Marxist Platform's Buzgalin ... 9
  - Shostakovskiy From Democratic Platform ... 11
  - Leningrad Initiative's Sergeyev ... 13
  - Trade Union Chairman Yanayev ... 14
  - Presidential Council Member Aytmatov ... 15
  - Estonia's Sillari ... 15
  - Russian Secretary Polozkhov ... 16
  - Gennadiy Pershin Speech ... 17
- Ilin Gives Secretariat Report to Congress *[TASS]* ... 18
- Radio Cites Marxist Platform's Buzgalin *[Moscow Radio]* ... 18
- Information Report on 6 July Proceedings *[PRAVDA 7 Jul]* ... 19
- TASS Summarizes 6 July Congress *[TASS]* ... 19
- PRAVDA Reviews 6 July Congress Session *[7 Jul]* ... 20
- Yakovlev Not To Run for Politburo *[Moscow International]* ... 20
- Gorbachev Meets Party Secretaries 6 July *[TASS]* ... 20
  - PRAVDA on Meeting *[8 Jul]* ... 21
  - Secretaries Heckle Gorbachev *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 7 Jul]* ... 23
- Congress News Conference Views World Issues *[TASS]* ... 25
  - More on News Conference *[TASS]* ... 25
- Democratic Platform Gives News Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jul]* ... 26
- Moscow TV Carries 7 July Proceedings ... 26
- Moscow TV on 7 July Congress Speeches ... 27
  - Ivan Melnikov ... 27
  - Secretary Ivan Frolov ... 29
  - Ukrainian First Secretary Gurenko ... 30
  - Peasants' Union Chairman Starodubtsev ... 31
  - Secretary Girenko ... 32
  - International Department Head Falin ... 33
  - Ryzhkov Answers Questions ... 34
  - Medvedev Answers Questions ... 36
  - Central Committee Secretary Yakovlev ... 40
  - Ligachev Answers Questions ... 43
  - Foreign Minister Shevardnadze ... 47
  - Gorbachev on Politburo Voting ... 50
  - Vladimir Ivashko ... 51
- Report on Medvedev Remarks at 7 Jul Congress *[Moscow Radio]* ... 54
- Report on Kuptsov Remarks at 7 Jul Congress *[Moscow Radio]* ... 54

- TASS Summarizes 7 July Session 54
  - 'Heated' Debate Over Resolution 56
  - Ligachev, Shevardnadze Cited *[TASS]* 56
- TV Reviews Congress Morning Session *[Moscow TV]* 58
- Deputies Heed Gorbachev Warning on 'Split' *[Moscow Radio]* 58
- Politburo Question Session 'Very Tumultuous' *[Moscow Radio]* 59
  - More on Question Session *[TASS]* 62
- Lebedev Reviews 7 July Congress Proceedings *[TASS]* 63
- Information Report on 7 July Proceedings *[PRAVDA 8 Jul]* 64
- Ukraine To Recall Congress Deputies to Parliament *[TASS]* 65
- Kazakh President Gives News Conference *[TASS]* 65
- Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Meet Workers 8 July *[Moscow Radio]* 65
  - PRAVDA Report *[9 Jul]* 66
  - Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 67
- Yakovlev Meets Democratic Movement Representatives *[Moscow TV]* 71
- Information Report on 8 July Proceedings *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* 72
- Commissions Meet on Rules, Draft Statement 8 Jul *[Moscow TV]* 72
- Press Conference Reviews Week's Sessions *[Moscow Radio]* 72
- Congress Resumes Work 9 July *[TASS]* 73
  - Gorbachev Ahead in Poll *[Moscow TV]* 73
  - Kryuchkov Answers Delegates' Questions *[Moscow International]* 73
  - Profiles KGB General Kalugin *[TASS]* 73
  - To Broadcast Proceedings 'In Full' *[Moscow Radio]* 74
  - Morning Session Reviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 74
- Moldavia's Luchinskiy Gives News Conference *[TASS]* 76
- Ryzhkov States Party Split Must Be Avoided *[Moscow International]* 76
- Gorbachev Comments on Congress Proceedings 4 July *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 5 Jul]* 77
- Shevardnadze on Congress, Cyprus Issue *[Athens RIZOSPASTIS 7 Jul]* 77
- Correspondents' Impressions of 4 July Session *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 78
- Belorussian Communists Hold News Conference *[TASS]* 80
- CPSU Congress Speakers Cited on Mideast *[Kuwait KUNA]* 81
- Kazakh Delegate Comments on Yeltsin, Ryzhkov *[IZVESTITA 9 Jul]* 81
- Arkhangelsk Deputy Notes Unproductive Discussions *[Moscow Radio]* 82
- Delegates Reportedly Neglect Workers' Interests *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 6 Jul]* 82
- Democratic Platform Views Gorbachev Speech *[London TV]* 82
- Committee Chairman Opposes Party Factionalism *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jul]* 83
- Congress Delegates Out of Tune With Public *[IZVESTIYA 4 Jul]* 84
- Party's Future Role Considered *[Moscow International]* 85
- Ryzhkov, Ligachev Inteviewed on Issues *[Bratislava PRAVDA 4 Jul]* 86
- Abalkin Views CPSU-Supreme Soviet Relations *[Budapest Radio]* 87
- Outcome of Congress, Nation's Security Viewed *[Bovin on Moscow TV]* 87
- Panov Cited on 'Contradicting Views' in Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 88
- Polozkov Rejects Russian 'Conservative' Tag *[Moscow TV]* 88
- Lithuania's Scant Congress Press Coverage Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Jul]* 89
- Baltic Communists Send Note to Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 89
- Congress Delegates Express Views in Poll *[Moscow TV]* 90
- Poll on Public Attitude to Congress Cited *[TASS]* 90
- Delegates Polled on Perestroyka Crisis *[Moscow TV]* 90

Moscow TV Reports 6 July Congress Proceedings

Morning Session

LD0607171690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1615 GMT on 6 July begins carrying a recorded report of the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow. An unidentified announcer introduces the report: "Today the congress continued debating the first four points on its agenda, perhaps the most important of which was the Political Report to the congress by the party's Central Committee delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The morning and afternoon sessions were chaired by Givi Grigoryevich Gumbardize, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party and chairman of the Presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet. He gave the floor to Comrade Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Moldavian Communist Party. We are transmitting both his speech and those by other participants in the debate, with some omissions:"

At 1616 GMT Luchinskiy says Gorbachev is not to be blamed for all of today's troubles. The problems would have had to be faced sooner or later, he thinks, adding that the party must be one of active deeds and civil accord. The congress should issue a statement of civil accord whereby all parties agree to work together, he concludes.

At 1618 GMT writer Maksimov talks about concern for problems of the Russian countryside, referring to decay of villages in his area, Smolensk Oblast. The party must help to revive the countryside, he says. The Central Committee has not responded to pleas in the press. Writers are also deprived; those in the rural areas are Russia's Palestinians, says Maksimov.

At 1621 GMT Delegate Gayvoronskiy says the party must be more aware of the situation at the grassroots level. Systematic work to ensure that representation covers this level must be carried out, he notes. To this end, he suggests direct election of members of the Central Committee should be carried out at oblast party conferences. Gayvoronskiy thinks the masses will follow a party that is directly involved with their concerns. He says the miners' strike in Donetsk followed statements from leaders that they were living well there. Farmers need concrete help, not exhortations to increase productivity. He suggests that if there were workers in the Politburo, there would not be all this industrial unrest. He points out that many of the noisy campaigns under perestroyka have not found support from workers. Gayvoronskiy suggests introducing referendums within the party, annual publication of accounts.

At 1628 GMT Alfred Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, takes the floor. *[The text of the recorded excerpts of Rubiks speech is published below]*

At 1632 GMT Delegate Kabelkova from Abakan speaks about the need for the development of national-state structure, with reference to Khakass Autonomous Oblast. Current attempts to enhance national rights are amateurish, she says, and people still fear being branded nationalists for campaigning for them.

At 1635 GMT the TV announcer says the chairman reported that a note was received by the Presidium asking when participants in the party forum who adhere to positions of the Marxist and Democratic Platforms of the Leningrad Constituent Congress would finally be given the floor. After all, there was an arrangement on this. A vote is taken: 3,029 vote in favor, 382 against, and 20 abstain.

At 1636 GMT Delegate Kugultinov speaks about the need for all to have full rights.

At 1637 GMT Absamat M. Masalityev, Kirghiz Communist Party first secretary,begins speaking. *[The text of the recorded excerpts of Masaliyev's speech are published below]*

At 1642 GMT Delegate Zakovryashina, a milkmaid, says those who abuse privileges have no place in the party. She asks when the leadership will stop just talking about the problems of the countryside? She wants a strong party and advocates keeping party organizations in workplaces.

At 1644 GMT Kakhar Makhkamov, Tajik Communist Party first secretary, begins speaking. *[The text of Makhamov's recorded speech is published below]*

At 1652 GMT Delegate Ulyanov, an actor, asks where the root of our mistakes lie. He says the promises to make everyone happy have not been fulfilled in the course of over 70 years. It has produced a socialism of silent cogs in the machine, he says. Anyone who tried to be different was trampled. He says that there is a "shortage of individuality." Perestroyka needs leaders, he notes, but there are so few of them. He believes it is thanks to perestroyka and glasnost that the people have started to stand erect. He says the party must be saved from iron-fisted regimentation. Ulyanov speaks of the sorry plight of cultural workers; many live below the poverty line. He asks: What can culture expect from market conditions? We have to understand the importance of culture and save ourselves from ignorance, he concludes.

At 1658 GMT the announcer says that the threat of a miners' strike came up again. The announcer says workers from other industries spoke. Railroad worker Rusak is shown explaining the difficulties a miners' strike would cause and appealing for the strike to be cancelled.

At 1700 GMT steelworker Mogilevtsev speaks for the workers of his industry, explaining their concern at the industrial disruption a strike could cause. Many industries rely on coal to survive. Successes in the social sphere cannot be achieved if the economy is ruined, he notes.

At 1702 GMT Vladimir Movsesyan, Armenian Communist Party first secretary, begins speaking. *[The text of the recorded excerpts of Movsesyan are published below]*

At 1706 GMT Boris Yeltsin begins speaking. He says the party has many problems. Conservatives have gone on the offensive and are fighting economic reform. False talk about unity has discredited the party among those who really want reform, Yeltsin says. The Politburo failed to choose the correct way of electing congress delegates he notes. The fate of the CPSU is in the balance, Yeltsin says. Will the apparatus be able to accept radical change? If not, the leaders who stick to old ways will lose their power, he warns. People will demand to take over party property. Yeltsin suggests that the fall of parties in East Europe should provide some lessons about what needs to be done. Pluralism of parties is inevitable he notes. The party must be one of the legislative type. Yeltsin says any actions should be allowed to be part of an alliance of democratic forces. Such a party will be accepted by the people, and together with a new union treaty could be a true vanguard. The choice, Yeltsin says, is between a renewed party and the old way leading to a split. Society has changed, it cannot be ordered about any more, says Yeltsin. It will not accept pie in the sky anymore, he says in conclusion.

At 1713 GMT Saparmurad Niyazov, Turkmen Communist Party first secretary speaks. *[The text of the recorded excerpts of Niyazov's speech is published below]*

At 1716 GMT Kustov, head of the Zapsib metallurgical workers, says people must be able to depend on the party's collective reason. In his opinion, a balanced political and economic program is needed. He says enterprises need to keep more of their profits and he talks about the various costs they have to bear. Market conditions must not be allowed to interfere with the vital connections between industries, Kustov reasons; they must be brought in step by step. The pending miners' strike could cause chaos. Kustov lists various suggestions from local communists about how the Central Committee should act to gain the confidence of workers.

At 1724 GMT Komsomol First Secretary Vladimir M. Zyukin, speaks. *[The text of the recorded excerpts of Zyukin's speech is published below]*

At 1729 GMT V.I. Potapov, of the Irkutsk party committee, speakes. *[Excerpts of Potapov's recorded speech are published below]*

At 1737 GMT Aleksandr Buzgalin, of Moscow University, speaks. *[The text of Buzgalin's recorded speech is published below]*

At 1746 GMT the recorded report ends and the television announcer says recorded coverage of the evening session will commence at 1900 GMT.

Report on Evening Session

LD0607194390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1900 GMT on 6 July resumes its recorded report of the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow. The evening session opens with Petr Luchinskiy, Moldavian Communist Party first secretary in the chair. He gives the floor to Vyacheslav Shostakovskiy, of the Moscow Higher Party School, who is representing the Democratic Plaform, who begins to speak at 1901 GMT. *[The text of the recorded excerpts of Shostakovskiy's speech is published below]*

At 1910 GMT Economist Aleksey Sergeyev, representing the organizing bureau of the Leningrad Initiative Congress of Russian Communists begins speaking. *[The text of the recroded excerpts of Sergeyev's speech is published below]*

At 1917 GMT the television announcer says Ilyin reported to delegates about the work done over the past four days. He lists the groups that have registerd with the Secretariat. About 400 people have had a chance to speak. The Secretariat is reviewing mail to the congress.

At 1918 GMT Gennadiy I. Yanayev, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, speaks. *[The text of the recorded excerpts of Yanayev's speech is published below]*

At 1925 GMT Chingiz Aytmatov, Presidential COuncil member, begins speaking. *[The text of Aytmatov's recorded speech is published below]*

At 1930 GMT Enn-Arno Sillari, Estonian Communist Party first secretary, begins speaking. *[The text of Sillari's recorded speech is published below]*

At 1934 GMT Ivan Polozkov, first secretary of the Russian Communist Party, speaks. *[The text of teh recorded excerpts of Polozkhov's speech is published below]*

At 1940 GMT Delegate gennadiy Pershin, from Bratsk, speaks. *[Excerpts of Pershin's recorded speech are published below]*

At 1946 GMT Belousov, a cement factory representative, speaks. Workers are being ousted from the party in order to break the party's back, he says. He says the Central Committee has failed to provide ideological guidance to communists at a time of difficulty. Belousov thinks the leadership should consult with party members before making major policy decisions. He mentions the Semipalatinsk nuclear test ground; tests have caused a radiation disaster in the area and the site must be closed immediately. If this is not done the consequences will be unpredictable, the people of Kazakhstan do not have unlimited patience. Belousov demands that the party return to class positions and defend the working people's interests.

At 1950 GMT Rodionova, a Khimvolokno worker, comes to the rostrum. We have economists but no economy, she ways. She believes no party will win popular support unless it is a party of honest people. It is wrong to blame Gorbachev and the government for everything, she says. What have you been doing for the country in the meantime, she asks the delegates. It's unclear, however, why some leaders are moved around from one job to another without taking responsibility for past mistakes, she says. Diversity of views and movements is a good thing—it will enrich the party and point the way ahead. Rodionova appeals to Gorbachev to solve the problem of black-marketeering in order to rehabilitate the party's reputation. Speculators are dicrediting the cooperative movement and causing communists to leave the party. Her speech is greeted by applause.

At 1957 GMT the television announcer summarizes the proceedings and says the congress will continue tomorrow. The report ends at 1959 GMT.

Luchinskiy Speech

LD0607172790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1616 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Petr Kirillovich Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] I believe that the current situation in the country is, to a considerable degree, caused by the inevitability of a transition from the command-administrative system to a democratic society of humane socialism. It was bound to happen sooner or later; neither market relations, multipartyism, nor the radical perestroyka of the federation would have passed us by. But the later we arrived at this the more painful and dramatic this period would have been for us. So it is unjust, to say the least, to blame Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his policies for all the difficulties we are now facing. Unfortunately, we are still unable to get by without lurching from one extreme to another: dethroning people and drawing new enemy images have become a distinguishing feature of our political culture.

What should the party be like in such conditions, conditions of political instability? We see it, first and foremost, as a party of vigorous action and of civic consent, capable of mobilizing the people for consolidation, an example of cultivating civilized relations in society. This is what the art of compromise is all about—finding a common language with different political currents, putting aside differences where they are not of a fundamental nature, and so on step by step.

In words we seem to recognize all of this, but we are not taking practical action. Moreover, the CPSU Central Committee is, for the most part, biding its time on these issues. So what can really be done here? I propose that immediately following this congress and on the basis of its decisions the CPSU Central Committee should come forward with the initiative of holding an all-Union meeting involving representatives from all parties and movements. This might end in the adoption of a joint statement on civic consent, on the basis of which the country would begin to work having set hurt feelings, ambitions, and prejudices to one side.

If we are opting for a Union of free states the republican Communist Parties must also become independent and unite on a qualitatively new principle—the ideological commonality of objectives and tasks expressed in the CPSU Program and Rules. At the same time they will have their own keynote documents. In drawing up policies and practical action they must be underpinned by the democratic and humane traditions of their peoples, their historical legacy, and the achievements of Soviet and world social thinking. I suggest that this provision be reflected in the program statement and rules of the CPSU. [applause]

Latvia's Rubiks

LD0607193390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1628 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Alfred Petrovich Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Our delegation came to the congress with the status of envoys of an opposition party, which is threatened in the republic by banning. Yes, distortion of the course of perestroyka has brought us to just such a situation. The tactics of endless compromises and the retreat of the previous leadership of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, the reports, which do not reflect the true position of things, by the Politburo members, Comrade Yakovlev and Medvedev, who have been in the Baltic republics in these years, the unjustified temporizing position of the CPSU Central Committee and Politburo in regard to the events in Latvia and the republic's Communist Party—all these are factors which have helped antisocialist forces to gradually replace the Soviet system with another, bourgeois regime in accordance with the 1922 Constitution.

Unfortunately, we have not heard a fundamental political appraisal of the state of affairs in the Baltic republics' Communist Parties and have not felt support for our struggle for socialism in this region even in the political report of the Central Committee at the current congress. Whereas the separatists are functioning actively. [applause]

The words soviet and socialist have already been removed from our republic's state designation. The parliament and government are conducting purposeful preparations for separating Latvia from the Soviet Union, sheltering behind the demagogy of a kind of transitional period. Socialist statehood is changing and being replaced by a bourgeois one. It is not only the state structure which is being restored but also the right of private ownership of any means of production including collective farm lands. This is being returned to those who owned it during the bourgeois period or to their descendants, including those living abroad. The new administration is not missing the opportunity to gain land today either—gentlemen from centers of local self-government and officials from the state apparatus are hurrying to gain it. The attributes of bourgeois Latvia are being revived, beginning with the address Mr. [Gospodin] instead of comrade citizen, and ending with the creation of large, profascist, nationalist, and militarized formations. Under the cover of slogans on perestroyka, antisocialist forces have taken possession of all the mass media in the republic, including the television and radio.

Nationalist forces have strengthened their ranks and have continued to conduct dual policies—saying one thing and doing another. Their aim was clear even two years ago: to compromise the CPSU, to provoke hostility, if not hatred toward everything which is Soviet and to restore bourgeois power in Latvia, taking the republic out of the Soviet Union.

Members of the newly elected—three months ago—Latvian Communist Party Central Committee have instructed me to speak openly about this at the congress. The Latvian Communist Party and its new Central Committee have elaborated tactics for action under these conditions. A battle is being waged and will be waged for the republic's development along a socialist path within a Union of sovereign states [applause]. Our grandfathers and great-grandfathers fought for this during the 1905 revolution, Latvian Red Riflemen gave their lives for this in 1917, and during the civil war. More than 18,000 communists, revolutionaries, and antifascists were repressed by the political secret police department [Ohranka] of bourgeois Latvia for this. One hundred and fifty six thousand servicemen from the Soviet Army who fell during the liberation of the republic from the fascist aggressors paid with their lives for this choice.

Remembering this, the Latvian Communist Party is coming out in favor of holding a referendum on the issue of the form of statehood in Latvia, taking into account the opinions of all strata of the population.

Almost 400,000 voters have already signed in favor of a referendum. Let foreign and certain homebred political scientists and journalists not hasten either to make declarations about the conservative character of our party. For us it is not only a policy but also a way to consolidate and democratize our tiny multiethnic republic and a way to really improve all the living conditions of everyone living in its territory. [applause].

Kirghiz Secretary Masaliyev

LD0607192990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1637 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Absamat Masaliyevich Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, at the 6 July 28th CPSU Congress session at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] What should the party be like? An active political force consolidating society, or should it, leaving behind the positions of Marxism-Leninism, become a parliamentary-type party, in other words, a debating club? The Kirghiz Communist Party delegates favor a strong and democratic communist organization and give their firm backing to the strategic drive for its radical renewal. Freedom of factions and groupings, the dismantling of the CPSU's organizational basis and depriving it of its theoretical basis must not be permitted, however. We must all of us, at the center and at the local level, stop passing off what we would like as really to get to grips with the economy, bring the country out of the crisis, introduce order, and strengthen discipline.

It is naive, comrades, to bank on anything else. When we talk about a multiparty system, we must not forget that democracy is measured not by the number of political parties but by their in-depth understanding of society's tasks and the interests of a multinational people and by their joint constructive activity. However, this is not working in practice. As practice shows, even the first steps toward a multiparty system are causing the division of society according to social, ethnic, or religious features. By manipulating an increase in national self-awareness and the national spirit, the new movements and associations are inciting nationalism and separatist sentiments.

We became convinced of this during the days of the tragic events in Osh Oblast, which led to the deaths of dozens of innocent people and the burning and ransacking of houses and other facilities. The party committees can see their errors and omissions here. We are drawing conclusions from them.

At the same time I would like to tell the congress that one of the causes of the interethnic conflict was, along with the fact that social and economic problems were not solved, the fact that informal associations are producing autonomist ideas and inciting people's emotions with arguments as to which people are the more ancient, whose culture is the more valuable, and so on.

In this tragedy, dear comrades, we saw once again the vital need for a strong center and a single Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In the period under review, haste and inconsistency appeared in the activities of the Central Committee and the government and serious oversights have been committed in implementing the cooperative movement, economic reform, and the agrarian policy. Do you remember the March Central Committee plenum which we had awaited with impatience? And we are all familiar with the results. The CPSU Central Committee took a passive stance on such issues of principles, over which public opinion was in a ferment, as the problems of property, land and the market economy, and failed to make public a clear attitude of its own to these, which has had an effect on the authority of the party.

It would, at this difficult period, have been useful to return to the party's prerevolutionary experience when it had two programs, the maximum and the minimum programs. The latter, let's say, could be compiled for five years, determining concrete aims and the means of achieving them. The people should, after all, be aware of what awaits them in the immediate future and what obligations the party is assuming. The party is losing authority to a considerable extent because with regasrd to our political opponents we defend ourselves more, and then sluggishly and timidly. We are not waging an open and offensive struggle. [applause] Do you remember with what fury Lenin and the Bolsheviks would enter into polemics with their opponents, using the press and public meetings? Not only did they expose the essence of the opposition, they convinced the masses that they were right. And we should take these valuable traditions on board. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Tajik First Secretary Makhkamov

LD0607215590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1644 GMT 6 Jul 90

[Speech by Kakhar Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajikistan Communist Party and chairman of the Tajikistan Supreme Soviet, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] It seems to us that the thesis that was heard in the political report that the vanguard role of the CPSU must not be thrust upon society is fundamentally important for our discussion about the tasks of the party at the present moment. It must only be won by an active struggle for the interests of the working people and by practical deeds to implement them. We see the task of the present day as that of achieving the renewal of society and the state through renewal of the party.

In the time of glasnost quite a lot has been written and said about the mistake made by our party throughout its almost century- long history. In my view, even considerably more than there actually was, criticism of the CPSU, however, is not subsiding. Ever new accusations are being made against the party. They hasten to accuse us not only of today's problems, but of those that the country might have to face tomorrow.

In none of the new politicized organizations, moreover, are they in a hurry to take upon themselves the responsibility for tackling the social and economic problems of the current moment. I do not believe that the political opponents of the CPSU do not know the ABC of democracy. Where there is the right to act, there is also the obligation to be responsible. And we in the CPSU have not ceased to constantly be engaged in self-recrimination and exhausting internal party struggle, slandering one another both within the party as well as between the parties, political groups, and formations. When they are distracted by them, they become detached from the soil of the interests of the working people, absolutely not to the benefit of the fatherland. It can only serve mercenary goals, remote from those of the people, of the interests of the initiators of the endless skirmishes. Against a dismal background, people's lives and work are deteriorating, their striving for economic and political stability has not been satisfied.

In this respect I would definitely like to say that the insistent attempts to draw us into fruitless discussion, to push the CPSU onto the sidelines of social and political life, contain a destructive moral charge aimed not only against the party, but against society as a whole.

For while the party is still in the state of internal discord we cannot hope that either the presidency or the renewal of all levels of Soviet power would have any positive effect. There cannot be any genuinely strong and active power without the support of a powerful, well developed political structure, which is what the party is. In other words, the renewal of the CPSU could destabilize the socio- political situation in the country even more.

In recent years problems of interethnic and interregional relations have become one of the most morbid manifestations of social instability. It is unthinkable to attempt any further renewal either of society or the party without resolving the complexities that have arisen here. We have no right to overlook this obvious link. In this connection, it ought to be ascertained that the decisions of the special plenum of the CPSU and the party platform on interethnic issues have failed to be effective since the state legal mechanisms designed to resolve them have not been created or are not in operation.

The elaboration of a state union treaty needs to be speeded up. It is naive to suppose that having used national and regional differences to pull the party apart, and having wrecked the socialist principles of federal relations, certain people will be able to make a sharp leap toward the heights of well-being and social justice. To take a real step forward, it is necessary to take a sober look at the past. For decades the communist parties of the union republics have been built into the functioning of a unitarian state, being independent only formally. And therefore while only formally reflecting the desires of the people in the political frontline of which they stood, they implemented one sidedly and sometimes recklessly the so-called social order of the center. The consequences of this tendency are well known: they include minimum sovereignty of republican party organizations, the ignoring of the existing ethnic interests and priorities, and finally deformed relations with the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee, especially with the section engaged in organizational and cadre work.

In the recent past the central apparatus adopted strong-willed decisions many times, and then at its own discretion, and sometimes despite the directives of the congress and the party conference, changed its positions.

Responsibility for these fluctuations was put on communists in republics, on local party bodies and their leaders who could not but appear in the eyes of their own people to be conservatives clinging to old things and to power.

As a matter of fact, things could not have gone any other way while the CPSU as a whole was adapted to serve the authoritarian bureaucratic system.

Having critically analyzed our recent past, the 21st congress of the Tajik Communist Party nonetheless stated its position decisively: we are for a united CPSU but at the same time we are in favor of a degree of real independence for the republican communist parties that would allow them to define for themselves specific political aims of their activities and ways of achieving them, proceeding first and foremost from the interests of the people. We think that economic relations of the union of sovereign soviet republics should be formed on the same principles.

We are disturbed by the fact that communists are being single- mindedly given an enemy image in public opinion and the mass consciousness. They began with Stalin and have arrived at Lenin. At the same time they are trying to discredit those on whose initiative perestroyka began, with the general secretary personally taking the brunt of the blow. How is all this to be understood? The answer, in my view, is straightforward: it is Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev himself who called us to perestroyka and who unites us, radicals, conservatives, and representatives of different platforms. At the most critical moment in the life of Tajikistan—those days in February—when not only the authority of our people but also the fate of our republic were being decided, I phoned Comrade Gorbachev and was given the following advice: only political consensus, only direct talks with people, only revival and continuation of respectful dialogue with people.

Finally, yes—as long as we can distinguish between wisdom and demagogy, devotion and hypocrisy, commitment to principles and stubborness, as long as we preserve our party against division and strengthen its political, organizational, internationalist unity and moral foundations, as long as our ideals are attractive to young people shall we really remain in practice the vanguard political force of society. May that objective, hope, and confidence give us extra strength and resolve to labor for the good of the people. Thank you. [applause]

Ulyanov Speech

LD0707133290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1652 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Mikhail Aleksandrovich Ulyanov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR Union of Theater Workers chairman of the board, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] What is the reason for all our failures? It would seem that the idea is an excellent one and that the dream is a noble one—to make everyone happy and equal. How much blood was spilt in order to implement this idea. How many good heads rolled. And, as far as life is concerned, things have turned out quite the other way around. It is hardly the case that everyone is equal. It is, likewise, hardly the case that everyone is happy. Why?

How is one to renew socialism which has not yet yielded success, even though the timeframe to fulfill what had been promised was quite a long one—over 70 years? Maybe there is no need to renew a socialism of inflexible dogma, a socialism of cheerless leveling-down, a socialism of paupers, a socialism of mute pawns, a socialism of impenetrable leaders and mute masses, a socialism of a dense herd of those who have been made equal in their poverty and total dependence, a herd which, due to its anguish and hopelessness, is ready to trample underfoot any person who fails to resemble it, who has the audacity to think differently from all the others, who has the audacity not to regard himself as being subordinate to the norm the herd has created in its own image and likeness, a socialism which, at one time, was deflected from its true path to begin to serve not the people, but the leaders and the naked idea?

This turning point did not begin now. And at present we have in our country a shortage of individuals, personalities, talents and dignity, the latter being, perhaps, the most terrible shortage of all, since it can not be resolved with ration cards.

Well, life has now, today, thrown us a challenge, but you can count the leaders on the fingers of one hand: Gorbachev and Yeltsin, Popov and Sobchak, Sobchak and Popov, Gorbachev and Yeltsin! [laughter, applause]

But perestroyka needs real leaders and there is a tragic shortage of them. The convenient feeling of—this is nothing to do with me—of a lack of responsibility and not giving a damn about anyone or anything has become too deeply ingrained in most of us. [passage omitted]

It is only now, thanks to Gorbachev's policy of glasnost and democratization, that our talented people have begun to straighten their backs. But as soon as this happened voices began to be heard to the effect that Gorbachev has let the the reins slip from his hands, that there is chaos, anarchy, and collapse of socialist ideals and a decline of discipline in the country.

All this is true but deep down, and for the time being surreptitiously, other ideas lurk. It would be ever so good to go back to the iron fist, to uniformity and homogeneity, to the orderly ranks where people did not even dare to say a word.

Well, no, God save us from yet another iron fist. It gave us nothing except blood, repressions, and reaction. It is not an iron fist that we need. We need a cast iron, powerful statehood, a law-governed, democratic statehood, capable both of protecting its own citizens and of defending itself. It must be strong enough not only to make goods laws, but also to be able to have the strength and potential to demand that they are observed to the letter. [passage omitted]

When will we at long last come to understand that we are decivilizing ourselves, that ignorance is clouding over the field of culture like algae are clouding our rivers and lakes?

Culture must be saved. Culture represents immunity against savagery, ignorance, and barbarism. An unprotected organism perishes without immunity. A society may perish without cultural immunity. [applause]

Armenia's Movsesyan

LD0607191990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1702 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Vladimir Migranovich Movsesyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, at the 6 July 28th CPSU Congress session at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] The communists of Armenia believe that the Soviet Union must become a Union of sovereign states with diverse relations among them. The nature and content of contacts among the Communist Parties of the Union republics and with the center must be adequate to the new structure of statehood. Our party's future is seen as an alliance of independent Communist Parties of sovereign states. We feel that this concept should form the basis of the 28th congress program declaration and of the new party rules. Unfortunately, the draft declaration does not fully reflect the significance and depth of the processes that are occurring. It suffers from a striving for effect, and in many respects fails to measure up to the urgent issues dictated by life. In the conditions which obtain in our country, to set human rights against the rights of a nation is politically dangerous, since it could serve to justify the trampling of national rights ostensibly in the name of human rights.

One is puzzled, to say the least, by the attempt to make a nation's right to self-determination dependent on administrative-territorial status, and by the fact that it is being described as separatism. As has been rightly noted in the Central Committee's political report, the significance of the ethnic question was not at first recognized. Judging by the materials and speeches of the congress delegates, we are still underestimating it. Although a special plenum was devoted to this issue, and the CPSU platform adopted, our political arsenal still does not contain the appropriate structurs and machinery for resolving it, and we lack the legal principles for settling interethnic relations. Conflicts in this sphere are decided mainly by force. The Army and internal troops are in effect paying for the politicians' shortsightedness and dilatoriness.

I consider the Central Committee's work in the sphere of nationalities policy to be unsatisfactory. We have got to work out a flexible state legal mechanism for coordinating and pooling our efforts, especially in coping with the aftermath of national disasters such as Chernobyl, the Aral, and the Armenian earthquake, and others. The absence of such a mechanism has led to the alarming situation that has developed in our republic. The Armenian people are deeply grateful for the sympathy and aid we have received; but today the program for repairing the earthquake damage has broken down completely. Of the republic's 3.5 million inhabitants, about a million, including 260,000 refugees, will be forced to spend their third winter in tents and temporary accomodations. The situation dictates the pressing need for the USSR Supremne Soviet to draw up and approve a state program to eliminate the consequences of the earthquake in Armenia, and also to recognize the legal status of all refugees.

Comrades, the Armenian delegates consider that it is only through radical renewal of the party, a democratization of society, and the creation of a state based on the rule of law, and not by means of a strong and firm hand, nostalgia for which has been evident even at this congress, that the prestige of the CPS8U can be restored and the country extricated from its situation of crisis. Thank you.

Turkmenistan First Secretary Niyazov

LD0707011190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1713 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Saparmurad Atayevich Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] In Turkmenia political and economic reform, glasnost and democratization—the basic components of perestroyka—are being implemented relatively calmly. This may be because the Turkmens have always lived and continue to live in harsh climatic conditions where a sip of water is prized like a gold nugget, and therefore they have learned to value everything that is good and reasonable.

Perestroyka has intuitively sensed to be that sip of water and so we were not prepared to cast stones into the spring which yielded it. We instead set about clearing its as yet not very deep channel with patience and virtue. We are often asked: Why is there so much peace and harmony in your republic? Is there nothing contradictory here which does not fit the channel of perestroyka?

I think that to some extent the advantage in our position lies in the fact that these are stormy times for the country, and when tension first mounted in one place, then somewhere else, we did not go in that direction. We went our own way. We did not set about adopting anyone else's experience of perestroyka. All our attention we concentrated on social needs. We were not in a hurry to bring in a state language. We elaborated a program which was in the interests of all residents of the republic, regardless of which ethnic group they belonged to. The Turken language, having become the state language, took its proper place in the system of values.

The main thing is that all the time we patiently explained to the people that a sense of one's own identity which leads to peace is better than being a slave to a fashion which risks conflicts. In this way, I think we have [word indistinct] the idea of independent development and have to some extent set the scene for moving forward.

We are for a renewed federation, for the choice of state structure being determined not by a prior scheme but by life's realities. We are for an independent Communist Party which has freed itself of guardianship from the center and will be able to direct the process of development of the republic, taking account of its specific characteristics. In a word, we are for a path to order and good sense, which each republic should lay in a sensible and individual way. This is today the only path leading to peace and harmony and not to the undermining of the foundations of socialism.

As for our republic's place in the country, it has long since occupied that place and I shall mention that the notion of fatherland is an historical one. We shall not be departing from that place, we are not preparing to rupture the ties of many years. This not for the sake of slogans of internationalism but rather from considerations of common sense which tell us today that the key to escaping from the crisis to new levels of democracy and humanism lies in unity in the country and unity in the party. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Komsomol First Secretary Zyukin

LD0707041790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1724 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Vladimir Mikhaylovich Zyukin, first secretary in the Komsomol Central Committee, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] We must realize that the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] that was prepared to fulfill any task set by any government, and which was personally devoted to any leader no longer is in existance. Nor does that Komsomol exist whose relationship with the CPSU was determined by the length of the lead and the strength of the collar placed on one apparatus by the other.

Our stance reflects the logic of development, the main contours of the future Union of Young People, and our vision of the CPSU's tough policy. First and foremost, in our opinion, the party should acquire the ability to forecast the development of a situation and take steps to keep abreast of it.

Just look at the way events unfolded only recently: Just last year the party leadership had not taken on board the idea of the institution of the president, it was happily explaining why Article 6 should not be dropped, and was painstakingly quoting Lenin as an argument against the creation of a Russian Communist Party. Just a little later it was making itself out to be the initiator in tackling these issues. But, subject to party discipline, all ranks of party officials initially embarked on a defense of one posture, and then quite suddenly of another totally different stance. In this way they discredited themselves in the eyes of the public at large.

It seemed, then, as though the party leadership was the instigator of perestroyka, while the whole of the middle-ranking leadership were conservative forces. The upshot was that the party's prestige plummeted.

Comrades, I believe there are many new problems in the same situation at this congress. Let's take the federal structure of the party. There was hostility to this idea in the report. However, life is demonstrating quite convincingly that the new understanding of the USSR as a union of sovereign states is quite simply inconceivable without a radical review of the relationship between the center and the republican committees.

The principle of a federal structure is the only possible way in which republican organizations can interpret a situation in their own fashion, and is the only way in which each communist party can establish itself as a real political force in its own republic. Incidentally, the draft CPSU rules have defined many, many norms for a federal structure. So why do we again have to struggle against what might well be a reality by tomorrow?

Or there is the question of the functioning of party organizations at the enterprise. Yes, it is fundamentally wrong to initiate a retreat from the enterprise. But nor is it far-sighted to posit the unambivalent: We will die before we live. And even if the bodies of state power in the country do not announce a ban on the party's activity at the enterprise, then the coming market economy—in conjunction with pluralism—will, in a number of cases, start resolving these matters itself.

Let us just conjure up the scene—there are many enterprise heads in this hall. Just imagine how, with three or four parties in existence at an enterprise, these parties will try to influence the head. We would get to the stage when the election of a works director would be held on a multi-party basis! And so, today it would be correct to predict and prepare for the possibility of the establishment in a number of instances of new ways in which communists might associate—territorial organizations, party clubs, so forth.

I should say up front that the majority of my Central Committee comrades and I are in favor of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party. Confirmation of this has been the early steps taken by the Komsomol to set up a Russian Komsomol. The whole question, though, is how these steps are taken. For we, with significantly less experience in life and politics, are still setting about this task not from above, but from below. As you may know, the first stage of the Congress of RSFSR Komsomol organizations just passed a decision on the expediency of setting up a Russian Komsomol and mapped out possible contours for it.

It was only after consultation with Russia's Komsomol members and after plena of the oblast and kray komsomol committees made the decision to join such a union that it was constituted at the second stage of the congress and its rules and program of action were confirmed. Even after all that, comrades, not all organizations have yet made the decision to join the Russian Union of Young People.

For this reason we do understand the negative reaction from many party organizations to the decisions made by the Constituent Congress of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party. Today—with the country on the verge of a social explosion—people will only accept, support and give a vote of confidence to a political force which, apart from strategic objectives, can offer a concrete and realistic program which they understand to get the country out of its crisis.

And so, we propose, here at this congress, setting up a special commission which could, in July and August, draw up a concrete program—complete with timescale and actions—which a plenum of the newly constituted Central Committee could put to the fourth session of the Supreme Soviet. The brains and experience of the CPSU should be employed in drawing it up, along with all other political forces. The 28th congress could be the initiator of a bloc of reformists, irrespective of their party affiliation. Therein lies the party's opportunity to consolidate society.

Esteemed comrade delegates, the irreversibility of perestroyka—which democratic forces have spoken about for so long—has patently come about. Therefore the CPSU, which had frozen its own reform until that was achieved, must now take three steps forward at this congress, otherwise perestroyka might carry on, but no longer with the party.

Irkutsk Oblast Secretary Potapov

LD0607211190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1729 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by V.I. Potapov, first secretary of the Irkutsk Oblast Party Committee, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The point is not only errors in the economy. I would like to stress this in particular. The deadlock has emerged to a large extent because, having proclaimed the slogan of perestroyka that man is the main point, at the same time nothing was added either to practice or theory for its full realization, so as to make man a man of labor, a man of high morality and culture, a creator and keeper of socialist values. Everyday practice tells us of the dullness and greyness, the failure to work through these questions.

To no small degree this found confirmation in the less than brilliant reports of our main ideologists and organizers of the party's cadres work, members of the Politburo. In this period of crisis they are telling us about how many newspapers they have published, how the mass media have changed. But they don't tell us about the direction in which objectivity has changed. In the person of Comrade Medvedev and in the person of the respected Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, they have even recalled Jesus Christ and many more playful things besides. [applause]

At the same time no account has been given as to why there is degradation of the individual, why society is intensively dividing into strata, why many socialist values are being lost, and what measures are being taken as a result by the party Central Committee, the Politburo, and by them personally. We are told that in this period no scientific concept of ideological work is needed, but that practice is needed, that is, we are presented with the concept of movement by groping our way, the price of which is well known to all of us, and there is no need to speak of this in detail. There is nothing more terrible than the trials of minds and human foundations, for this is primary to the entire process. In a word, Mikhail Sergeyevich, you need a new, renewed political team, and I think that the congress will help to do this. [applause] [passage omitted]

Marxist Platform's Buzgalin

LD0707135490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1737 GMT 6 Jul 90

[Speech by Aleksandr Buzgalin, from Moscow University and representing the Marxist platform, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] How are we to overcome the power of the party bureaucracy, which is making itself felt even at this congress? I do not need to give examples. How are we to achieve a position where each of us, coming back down to his party organization, can say: I know what to do to drag the country out of the mire. How are we to do that? We have answers to these questions.

The Marxist Platform is ready to offer you alternative options and answers. Our platform did not arise as a faction or a separate party. We do not intend to split the CPSU. Our task is to prove to communists that only the party's democratization and the country will secure our movement along the road of the socialist choice and a communist future. We will not achieve success without this consistent, resolute democratization. The people will turn away from us.

We have a totalitarian and bureaucratic system which has used the cement of violence to bind together the most heterogeneous layers—bits of socialism and bits of state capitalism and even semi-feudal relations. What is going on today beneath all that? Today this system is decomposing and the stench of this decomposition is poisoning the first fresh air of freedom which we started breathing literally a few years ago.

Where are we to go in these conditions? What should we choose? Some people say: That's enough. There's a very strong smell already. Let's go back. Let's tighten the screws and not surrender our ideals. That is a very attractive slogan, especially to those who have given the party their lives, their talent, and their energy. But will we not be returning to a dead end from which there will be no way out at all? Others say: No, let's do it differently. Let's proceed along the course of civilized countries, by practically introducing their platforms into our life today. What will we get in this event? In the best case, we'll get an India, where there are nuclear missile complexes and hundreds of millions of people who are semi-destitute, even by Soviet standards. But there is also the threat of a Pinochet-style dictatorship, where U.S. adviser [Milton] Friedman developed the ideas of private enterprise and a free market under the patronage of new bloody dictators.

So what can we do all the same? There is a third way. Yes, there is and it does not lie in the middle, as many of our party leaders are proposing. It lies in going beyond the others, as has already been said at this congress, in moving along the road to the economy, politics, and strucure of social forces of the 21st century.

What does that mean? In the economic sphere the key question is that of ownership, the question of who will be the owner. What answers are we being offered? A very amorphous one: either a leaseholder, or a shareholder, or a private owner. But what is a leaseholder or a shareholder? It is not ruled out that the old smart operator from the shadow economy and a part of the top bureaucracy will exchange the power of ownership, transplanting it from one office to another, while the labor colectives remain on the sidelines as they were before.

Is there an alternative to that or not? Yes, there is. What is it? We feel that we cannot proceed along the path of denationalized ownership and debureaucratization by selling off enterprises to private individuals. Instead this must be implemented through the independence of labor collectives and their real self-management, through contractual relations between the center, producers and consumers, through democratically-elaborated, long-term, special- purpose programs for structural perestroyka. This is the road to the revival of social ownership because it has proven in economic terms that it is more effective than the private variety. If we manage to do it, we will win. If we do not, the private operator will win, but then we will be worthless as communists or leaders. [applause]

That is the strategy. What is each one of us to do now when we join a labor collective? In the first place we must be able to act at the grass roots level, in such a way that communists turn out to be in the forefront of turning the worker, engineer, or peasant into master of the labor collective. There is a specific way—self- management, which must involve a real advancement of competent leaders who enjoy support from below, rather than being some sort of a game which it has now become. This then is what the party's cadre work will be all about. So, the issue is: either we do it, or the labor collectives will really drive us out of the enterprises and rightfully so, because we do not know how to work. But if we prove we can work then no kind of decision, no matter at what level it is taken, will be enough to drive us out of enterprises. [applause]

The second key economic question is the question of the market. A stereotype situation has emerged here: either we have a distributive cum administrative system, or else we will have this market of ours and we won't know who will hold sway here—the former mafiosi, or someone else? How do you act in these circumstances? It seems to me that where the market is concerned the working people and their associations can be masters here, too. Apart from what I already said about labor collectives and their independence let me add that international experience exists where associations of consumers, consumer societies—and these do exist in the USSR and many people in the hall probably have never even heard of them—regulate prices and quality for consumers rather than officials or academicians.

Experience exists where independent workers' movements and trade unions regulate employment, creating a flexible system of systematic retraining of personnel instead of unemployment at work and unemployment outside the factory gate. Experience exists where a social security system is not arranged in a way that several billion or even several tens of billions are given away to social security department functionaries, but in a way that the disadvantage and their democratic organizations—organizations of pensioners, young people, and the disabled—oversee what this money is spent on and how and where. You can rest assured that the money is not squandered in these circumstances.

Finally, one more point. Our market will only avoid being a black-marketeering mafia market if we ensure a precise correspondence between income and spending, a correspondence between the extent of work done and consumption. Commonly in this instance people say: You want to get into other people's pockets, into other people's souls. If the contents of a person's soul and his pocket are the same thing, perhaps they are right. But what is being proposed is something completely different. A monetary reform is being proposed which will be supplemented by single personal accounts [yedinyy imennoy schet], tax declarations, and progressive income and inheritance tax. These are elementary and even bourgeois-democratic measure which we are simply incapable of sorting out in the Soviet Union. [applause]

And the main thing about the party is this. What I want to focus attention on is that the party should not be composed of generals and foot soldiers. There should be genuine equality in the party. This equality should start with our congress. I have tried on a number of occasions to make myself heard and make the point that Politburo members reports will be a mere formality if congress does not assess them. Specifically, congress should judge them satisfactory or unsatisfactory. [applause] They will be a mere formality if a direct dialogue with congress is absent, if this condition is not met, if one is unable to say even a word to the face of a representative of a particular ruling body or Politburo members or Central Committee secretary. But that is only here, it is just one example.

Now for the situation in the party. I've almost run out of time. I'll be very brief. First... [bell rings]...Alright, literally two more minutes.

First, we have to ensure that the primary and regional party organizations have genuine autonomy. The basis of this is property and money. Consequently 50 percent and more of party dues should stay there—50 percent for the primary organizations above all. This will be the first step, the prime material resources to enable them to become genuinely independent.

The second point is that we should turn higher-level party committees above all—and I think this should apply to all levels—into executive and coordination bodies. Party discipline is necessary and obligatory, but it must be discipline in the fulfilment of collective decisions, and not discipline in fulfilling the directives of the party apparatus.

Third, we must ensure that there is genuine equality for platforms so that it does not require such an agonizing effort to make yourself heard in the newspapers or on the congress platform. We must make it possible for a communist to work in any mass democratic organization and not just in those which are oriented toward the socialist choice. We have already missed out on many mass movements. Many of them have ended up without a socialist orientation. That is our misfortune and it is something we have to rectify.

Are we afraid that our ideology will change if we go into particular organizations? We should be taking them with us, we should be capable of making them change their minds. The Marxist platform operates in the Confederation of Labor which, generally speaking adheres to an anti-socialist stance. But when you suggest to them a specific slogan in defense of the workers' interests they support it. I think that five out of six resolutions suggested to the Confederation of Labor were adopted, despite all the bawling against the party. That is the sort of spirit in which we should be working everywhere, it seems to me. Otherwise we will be driven out of democratic movements.

Now the last point about the party. The Marxist platform is opposed to our system of presidency squared [prezidentstvo v kvadrate] where congress elects a leader. In these circumstances, the minority will not be represented in our highest leadership body. When this occurs we will have a duality of power in the bodies of collective leadership and on the part of the party leader. The issue is this. Either we prove to the people by our actions that with us it will find a way out of the crisis better than without us, or the people will turn against communism. And all of us must act in this manner. All of us together should recall the great words of the proletarian anthem: No saviors from on high deliver. No trust have we in prince or peer. Our own right hand the chains must shiver... [preceding three sentences quoted from the Socialist Internationale anthem] [applause]

Shostakovskiy From Democratic Platform

LD0607224990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1901 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Vyacheslav Shostakovskiy, rector of the Moscow Higher Party School and representing the Democratic Platform, at the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 6 July—recorded]

[Text] The chief questions of our times are where we are going and how to proceed. To say to humane and democratic socialism is not an answer to these questions. I suggest that our immediate aims are firstly to form a civic society in which the law will guarantee the individual a free choice of the forms of his social, political, and economic existence, in which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will be genuinely affirmed, where there will be no monopoly of a single ideology or world view but where freedom of conscience will prevail.

Secondly, to create a state that is truly based on law in which only the law will hold sway and there will moreover undoubtedly be depoliticization of the Army, KGB, law enforcemnt bodies, and the apparats of all other state bodies.

Saying that the Army must not be beyond politics is mere trickery, a juggling of concepts. The Army is always and everywhere an instrument of politics. This is so, but of state politics, and only here one of party politics, and while the Army, like other state structures, continues to implement the decisions of the Politburo or the latest CPSU Central Committee plenum, we will not have a state based on law. And we will be ignorant of who gave a specific order and put the Army in action.

In military or any other form of state service and, indeed, everywhere, there should be a cult of professionalism and good conscience, irrespective of the party in which an individual carries out his political activities. He does this out of service time and, in theory, this issue is not for us, for the party, but an issue of Soviet power.

Thirdly, a flourishing economy based on the initiative and creative potential of the individual and the multiple structures of the market. How are we to move toward this? The most immediate and most basic thing is to remove ideological blinkers from economic activity. No ideological sacred cows will give us milk or meat, not even if we put them on one of Starodubtser's farms. Attempts repeatedly to drive the economy into an ideological corridor are futile and, to be more precise, actually criminal. That corridor could once again turn out to be a maze with no way out. For me there is one criterion of being socialist: the well-being and freedom of mankind, and forms of property are a matter of complete indifference. There is something else that is important:

how to make use of these forms of property, how they operate in people's interests, on their social state and the prosperity of society.

It is high time we stopped building castles in the air. Let's tackle real housing. I am convinced that the next generation will not live well if the people currently living on this Earth do not at least live tolerably. And for this to be so we need to address experience tried and tested by human practice and take its (?creativity), taking into account our own specific features and those of the republics. Much has been said here of the need for a program for getting out of the crisis and it is possible both to develop and adopt one. However, first, let's try and answer the question as to why life has not accepted, why life has rejected all our plans in the past or why do they produce so few results. At the 28th Congress the Central Committee's political report spoke of the need to learn the lessons of truth. The proposition was reinforced by the following words of Lenin: Our strength lies in stating the truth.

We will certainly not move ahead if we do not stand firmly on the position of truth and realism. And we have been evading this decisively for the whole of our history since the October Revolution. And we are once again risking leaving this congress without having cleared up the reasons for those deformations, mistakes, and crimes which are mentioned in the draft program of the program statement.

We need the truth no matter how bitter it may be. Then perhaps there will arise a basis for trust and constructive action. What is this about? First of all about socialist choice. Yes, the people followed the slogans of the Bolsheviks in 1917. But in the 73 years since we have been repeating these slogans again and again: Land to the peasants, factories to the workers, power to the soviets, peace to the peoples. We have not put these slogans into practice, we have not implemented them. The land has ended up with the peasant, but the state ended up, excuse me, without a boss, so in this way, factories ended up with departments, power with the party and on the whole there is no peace between the peoples.

And I would like to recall one more October slogan: Bread to the hungry. It takes on a new, tragic topicality. Why is this? This is a question that demands an honest and responsible answer from us. They say that the authors of the draft for socialist building worked badly. Okay, but is that the only reason? Are there not errors in the draft itself? It seems to us that there are.

In the first place there is a lack of a solution for the problem of no motivation to work in the new society. The concentrated efforts of many years to educate the new man, the refined man, as you see, have not been crowned with success. Man's nature, in part, turned out to be stronger. It is a lie when they say that our man is lazy, a hack, that he is almost a thief by nature. It's a lie. It is necessary to return the normal motivation for work and return economic interest and there will be a result, there will be weighty results. Everyone will begin to work, he will feel, and show, this interest, and implement it.

We need to say frankly: People of the land of the soviets, the party has profoundly realized its mistakes and will never in the future thrust its will on the peoples, it will never in the future, without asking the people, arrogantly pontifacate in its name.

I agree with delegate (Poruchikov), who said here that a tractor-driver party member who works on a bad tractor and (?cannot) make ends meet is not in any way guilty and bears no responsibility for the crimes of the party leadership. But the fact that he has ended up in such a position is the fault of the party as a system, a system that has rigorously implanted its ideology in every pore of the social organism on the principle that you cannot make an omelette without breaking eggs. In this respect repentance by the party is essential, and this would be a powerful factor for moral purification.

By the way, one other fundamental error of Marxism is its underestimation of the profoundly creative content of peasant labor, of the significance of rural traditions, and the special morality of grain farmers as regards the land. The manifesto itself talks of the mindlessness of rural life. The first thing that has to be done, and done without delay, is to respect and appreciate peasant labor, to finally heed Lenin's advice not to order the peasants around. To be fair. However, in our rather inhumane conditions no honest labor is appreciated, whether that of teachers, artists, scientists, or especially workers. And it is no coincidence that workers are replying to the continuous appeals from this rostrum by handing in their party cards.

We are constantly playing games, whether we mean to or not, consciously or unconsciously. We are playing games when we talk about the party as a union of fellow-thinkers. I would like to remind you, comrades, that this was Stalin's formula and for him it evidently had a particular meaning. We should not return to that. We are playing games when we claim that differentiation in property ownership is a product of perestroyka. The underground millionaire (Koreyka) is by no means the fruit of a writer's imagination but a literary figure in the spirit of socialist realism. Actually, (Koreyka) is small fry: the Soviet bourgeois is by no means a product of the NEP period—they were destroyed pretty quickly. He is a man with access to a huge machine distributing everything that is created in the spheres of material and intellectual production. Is not this powerful stratum of distributors the main source of sabotage of perestroyka?

We are playing games when we talk about consolidation as well. With whom and on what basis? Consolidation with perestroyka forces is fine, but what consolidation can there be with those who are urging us far back into the past. Let the people judge whom it should support and trust and whom it should not. [applause]

Leningrad Initiative's Sergeyev

LD0707002290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1910 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Dr. Aleksey Sergeyev, representing the organizing bureau of the Leningrad Initiative Congress of Russian Communists, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Within society, within the state, and within the party a battle between several alternatives is already under way—one conservative and two radical. The first approach is the conservative one and the repository of it, however sad this may be, is our own government.

This approach is reflected in the systems which have arisen as a result of the first five years of perestroyka—of a sluggish, stumbling slide of socioeconomic processes and structures toward a system of economic inequality. A real union between the shadow economy, of still underground capitalists, and the remains of the voluntarist, bureaucratic system still clinging to power, is taking shape on the basis of such an approach. The story of the ANT [Automation, Science & Technology] cooperative and state tentacles is a living exmple of this.

The second approach is, in our view, frankly reactionary, a bourgeois-radical one, and it is extremely strange that it is called, at the highest party levels, a left-wing and democratic one. The left-wing are those who are today calling for the shadow economy to be legalized and who are calling us to private ownership—the democrats are those who are graciously agreeing not to instigate proceedings against ordinary party members. I think that we are talking about an ultra-right, radical pro-bourgeois trend in our sociopolitical life [applause].

Within the framework of this trend, it is proposed that the following be considered as points of salvation: the sale into private hands of public enterprises and lands, including to foreigners; the stage-by-stage transformation of the whole country into a free economic zone; the counting on a limitless ability to attract foreign capital; the legalization of the shadow economy; and the policy of the conscious creation of a new type of social beacon, of super-rich people.

In this case the concept of the renewal of socialism turns out to be narrow and it is proposed that the word socialism be removed from the ideology of perestroyka. Both the first and second approach are, in our view, deadend; it is well known that they will not lead to an effective economy. They are advantageous to a so-called small group of people, which basically consists of talented rascals. [applause]

But nationwide accord cannot be attained on the basis of such approaches; they do not promise the basic mass of the people anything good either in 15 months or in 15 years time. Having practically become the semi-colony of the more developed capitalist countries, the USSR will in such cases quickly move on from the role of being simply being a beggar, to the role of a robbed beggar. Our people will not be able to bear such a perestroyka.

The party will also collapse because of this, it will become nonexistent as a Communist Party. We are being summoned toward the market economy. But there are three forms of the market. There is the market of goods, and I, Mikhail Sergeyevich, am one of those economists who has always, both during the years of stagnation and during the years of perestroyka, fought for this market with all of its categories—value, price, prime cost, profit, credit and interest.

But in addition to the market of goods there are another two markets. There is the market of private capital represented by stock exchanges and there is the labor market. These two markets taken together unavoidably form the classical capitalist market even if it is called a regulated one—one cannot escape from this.

In connection with this I would like to draw your attention to the following fact. The journal VOPROSY EKONOMIKI [QUESTIONS OF ECONOMICS] recently published the economic platform of the Democratic Union and it suddenly became clear that there was a great deal of resemblance between this frankly procapitalist platform and what the government is now proposing. So this is what turns out to be the real sense of the deideologization and depoliticization of the economy.

But the more that stereotypes that are incompatible with its collectivist essence are inculcated in the mass Soviet consciousness with the aid of the mass media monopolized by right-wing radical forces—stereotypes formed not only during the years of Soviet power, but, I stress, during the course of many centuries of historical development—the harsher will be the forms of the elemental dash of the people toward the choice compatible to October. For these people, Mikhail Sergeyevich, and their name is The People [narod], these people have nowhere to emigrate to. I realize that the economic platform of the Interregional Group and the Democratic Platform of the CPSU may be closer to some members of the Politburo than the position of the initiative congress or the Marxist platform is. Incidentally, I consider that it is time for us to unite with the Marxist platform. [applause] There will be more unity in the party, because we do not lay claim to any special platform.

So I think that the country will be saved not by Artem Tarasov, not by the ANT people, not even by Stanislav Fedorov—and Sergeyev has absolutely nothing to do with it. It will be saved by people like the metallurgist from Nizhnyy Tagil, the cotton grower from Uzbekistan, the hereditary peasant from the depths of Russia who are sitting here in the hall [applause], the soldier who passed through the fire of Afghanistan. The alternative founded on the developing material socialization of the processes of production finds support not only among semi-disgraced economists. Similar ideas are being developed by certain Soviet academicians. For example, they were developed by the late Academician Legasov; they are being developed by Academician Struminskiy, Academician Semanikhin, Academician Moiseyev, Academician Paton. For some reason the ideas of these people, who are very familiar with the internal contemporary mechanisms of scientific and technical progress, are not being implemented during economic perestroyka. They may say, (?well) they are not economists. That's true, but on the other hand they are truly academicians.

I opened the Moskovskiy Komsomolets for 27 April this year, and it said: If only one could point and say: Here is illicit money earned by dishonest work. But how can you know which is such money? It is better to think how to tie this money together so that it can find a way out. It can be used as share capital, for the sale into private hands of small shops and workshops, for handing land over to lease. I read and I realized that I am being invited to hold a feast in the Temple. The giver of the invitation is Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev.

The program of the party adopted at the 27th CPSU Congress is now losing its force, and this is natural: life moves forward. But I consider that some of the tenets heard at the 27th CPSU Congress are extremely topical today, and deserve to be repeated in the documents of the 28th congress. I am thinking, first of all, of the following words from the report by Mikhail Sergeyevich at the 27th congress: If private property mentalities start to appear, it means there has been something wrong in the choice of ways and means in our work, and there is a need to correct it.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak. [applause]

Trade Union Chairman Yanayev

LD0707022790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1918 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Gennadiy Ivanovich Yanayev, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] It seems to me that there must be no talk at the congress of the victors and the vanquished. We must do everything to preserve the unity of the party, all the more so since there are many models that coincide in the platforms offered to us. We must act in such a way that as a result of the congress there should be one single victory—the party, and its unity. [applause]

As for socialism, I have no aversion to the program being called humane, democratic socialism. After all, we have built socialism many times: developed socialism with an undeveloped agriculture, real socialism, mature socialism. I think that either there is socialism, or there is not. And we must tell the people clearly what kind of socialism we want to build. We want to build socialism as a society of free people, as a society of equal rights and equal opportunities, as a civil society, as a society of social protection.

God forbid, comrades, that we should resort to making use of a thing not found in short supply in our country: claptrap—excuse the unparliamentary expression. We must learn to speak with the people, with the working class, in the language of truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

The call was heard here for the repentance of the party, and the trial of the party. I want to express my opinion on this subject. I do not know any party in the world which has repented so much. In my opinion the party has been doing nothing over the last five years but repent. It seems to me that we must free the party from its guilt complex, its inferiority complex. We must give the party back its feeling of its own worth. We must not put a party of 18 million members in the pillory. [applause]

I think that we should not be preaching at the congress the principle of all or nothing, comrades. We need to search for ways of consolidation, even though Comrade (Chistakovskiy) does not like this consolidation. Certainly, if we preach the principle of harnessing together a horse and a delicate doe, then it will be difficult to consolidate. But I see three ways for consolidation.

First: We must study attentively and try to bring closer together the platforms that exist. There is such a possibility. Second: We must go along the path of the further democratization of the party. And third, a quite concrete program is needed for bringing the country out of its crisis situation, not in order to (?share) some theoretical postulate or other—the specific business is to consolidate party members from various platforms. I am convinced of this. We must use the congress to try to solve these problems.

The fate of the party is being decided not only at this congress, comrades. We can hold a stormy congress, a calm congress, we can work out clever documents. But the main thing is that the party should reveal, accumulate, express, and realize the dominating interests of society. It is only in this way that we can exist as a mass political party.

The party and the trades unions. I think that the program documents have taken a very decisive step forward on the path of establishing correct relations between the party and the trades unions. After over 70 years the drive belt has indeed been worn out. True, the condescending paternalistic formula contained in the program declaration is to the effect that the party recognizes the autonomy of the trades unions—thanks a lot—and I think we should take the next step, and say that the party builds its relations with the trades unions on a basis of partnership and equality.

Perhaps it would not be right to speak of this, were it not that some local party bodies are still trying to build their relations with the trades unions by command methods, and for some of them autonomy for trades unions still sounds like an alarm bell, and the imperative of the times—the demand of the times that we should build the work of the trades unions by political methods, via the communists working in the trades unions. This part of our work has so far been an aside to the practical side of the party.

I would particularly like to speak of the need for the Party to work in workers' organizations. Comrades, we have lost the political initiative. We are surrendering the working class to all sorts of people who are pursuing political objectives that are more than dubious. All sorts of anti-communist forces which are simply digging in "en masse" in the workers' movement are trying to excite it on their own platforms. I believe we need a special program of work within workers' organizations—both formal and informal. [applause]

Presidential Council Member Aytmatov

LD0707114590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1925 GMT 6 Jul 90

[Speech by Chingiz Aytmatov at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Could we get by without perestroyka? In so far as this problem directly affects the party's responsibility and the fate of the people, I think not. And not because some of us are supporters and some of us are not, some people still have hopes of perestroyka while some are in despair, and some have their pitchforks at the ready.

No, things are much more complicated. The phenomenon of perestroyka is a new achievement in the universal development of the human spirit. As opposed to social revolution, this is an acquisition of all our contemporaries including the opponents of perestroyka. It is a new stage in the life of the individual in a democratic society. It is a breakthrough of the times to civilized liberties and rights, in general, and in the totalitarian socialist countries, in particular. Tomorrow perestroyka will be left behind as the launch pad of the ideological struggle before a new spiral of social evolution.

It is for this reason too, that at the party congress whose corporative nature has always acted as an instrument of power of some people over others there now reigns freedom of speech and conviction, a matter to which we no longer pay consideration to but which is also an achievement of perestroyka as a new and previously unknown type of social revolution. And the epicenter of this agonizing, global process is ourselves, our long-suffering fatherland, our CPSU which is really the party of destiny in its present state and our new historical thinking which we have acquired with such difficulty on our way of the cross toward the truth which is the epicenter of this agonizing, global process. Is this a good thing or a bad thing? I do not know, but that is fate.

I might be asked straight out why I assert the above despite of the frenzied attacks from critics who fall upon perestroyka from the left and the right, from the top and from the bottom. I shall try to reply. It is because the criticism of specific facts should not cloud the minds of our contremporaries to the main essence. The ideas of perestroyka which have been won at a hard price in our postwar society were the long sought for and long awaited consensus of the opposing sides in order to save world peace.

At present we do not seem to notice this as we are embroiled in daily political passions, but I would compare this salvation—as if we had managed to avert the end of the world as foretold in the Bible—to the salvation of human kind condemned, for the sake of so-called ideological principles and the confrontation of political systems, to preprogrammed destruction. For example, Mao Zedong calmly allocated some 500 million human lives to this fate for a start. We can say to ourselves that the salavation has been accomplished and, in this context, perestroyka has won the right to be regarded as a manifestation of the highest degree of humanism and that is its main service to history.

I do not try to justify the present mess and miscalculations and the increasing difficulties of our life. But the crisis and everything now accompanying this destructive process have long been fermenting in the depths of the past bar-room socialism, and, in essence, perestroyka is now feeling on itself the blows of that failed, cruel fate which befell our country in its primorial, vicious attempts to impose the socialist system on the world by force and not by economic superiority.

Otherwise, how can one explain the fact that the society led by the CPSU over a period of three-fourths of this century, having at its disposal really planetary resources, ended up in the backyard of the scientific-technological revolution of the present day? Why is our labor productivity so low and why is the quality of our output so wretched? Why is it that our people, in their masses, do not think of working as they would if they were working for themselves, for their families, for their home, for fair enrichment for fair work?

Do those communists think about this who so scrupulously calculate each time the percentage of participation by workers and peasants at some or other huge, long, 1,001 nights meeting which are innumerable at present, as if this is precisely what the fate of the country depends on at present? One should think not so much about the percentage as about something else: how to resolve one of the basic problems of our life. The whole of world experience shows that their is no better manager than the proprietor. Our party task, in my view, is to help the workers and peasants to comprehend this problem: do they wish to become modern proprietors via a shareholding system or various and different forms of self-management which are so widely employed in the social practice of other modern highly developed countries?

Estonia's Sillari

LD0707111390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1930 GMT 6 Jul 90

[Speech by Enn-Arno Sillari, Estonian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Why is ours a course leading to the Estonian Communist Party's independence? Everything is due to the same reason. It is essential to take into account the specific local conditions, different historical experience, different conditions of development, and different traditions. This demands, insistently so, that independent republican communist parties must be set up. They will have programs, rules, and membership all of their own. They will be turned into real political parties, capable of reacting flexibly and rapidly to whatever turn of events take place. This, in turn, presupposes a renewal of organizational principles of the CPSU's structure.

A union of communist parties—this formula, which appears at first sight to be seditious, has already been repeatedly mentioned at our congress. For the time being it is hardly the case that everyone accepts it and this is understandable. The many years of the CPSU's experience, existence, and functions is not something that allows everyone to easily reconcile themselves to a new form of its structure. It even seems to many that this will finally destroy the CPSU. However, logic and a sense of reality and understanding of how events will develop further give us grounds for asserting that this will not be the case. On the contrary, the party, as we have come to know it and as it is today, an inflexible and rigid structure with no possibility for political maneuvering, is hardly able to count on political leadership at present.

It is often said that the principle of federalism will lead to the party's disintegration and fragmentation into national cells. But we are not talking of a national party or, to be more precise, of a party of just one nationality, but of the independence of a republican communist party—a republican party with a membership comprised of communists of many nationalities. Moreover, we are convinced that a party confined to just one nationality is in deep contradiction to the foundations of communist ideology. These parties will hardly be able to live and work effectively in the present conditions. We have here in mind the conditions in our republic too.

In the theses of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee for the 28th congress, which were drawn up on the basis of the program adopted by our 20th congress, we set out our positions and view on the development of processes in the CPSU and the Estonian Communist Party. The delegates have these theses in hand. The congress proclaimed the transition to an independent Estonian Communist Party. A central committee was elected that we call a coalition since its members include representatives of those who support the adopted program and also those who do not support it but consider it necessary to tackle many issues together. There is a third point of view too among the republic's communists which is represented in this hall. Perhaps it would be worthwhile for the congress delegates to also hear other standpoints.

What I would like to say as well is that the main thing in current conditions is to maintain the party's influence over the processes occurring in the republic and its prestige among the indigenous population and to maintain and rally together a strong left-wing force in the republic that is capable of defending the social interests of the working people during the transition to a market economy. This applies incidentally not just to the Estonian Communist Party but also to the communist parties of other Union republics.

It seems very important to us that the congress delegates and the country's communists as a whole adopt an understanding attitude to the problems of the republican communist parties, including our own, and respond calmly to what may be unusual decisions and proposals without considering them straight off as incompatible with the principles of the Communist Party.

Russian Secretary Polozkhov

LD0707004490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1934 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Ivan Polozkov, first secretary of the Russian Communist Party, at the 6 July 28th CPSU Congress session at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] The period of disorder and instability in the party has become extremely protracted, and it is time not only to determine what is happening to us, but to immerse ourselves with an awareness of the need for unity and balanced and constructive actions. In this sense the documents that have been presented to the congress inspire a feeling of confidence and optimism, they have absorbed the collective reason of the communists of the country, their proposals and observations.

I cannot agree with the prophets who foretell a lamentable lot for the CPSU and a dramatic fate for communists, but the party needs to take special actions now. A quest is under way for its role in the new situation, and we are currently at the sources of the regeneration of the CPSU as a political institution which has shaken off the burden of state administration.

The roads of renewing the CPSU have led to the creation of a communist party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. This idea was generated from the grassroots level, it had been maturing for many years in the thick of the party masses. It found the full support of an absolute majority of party organizations and oblast and kray conferences. The constituent congress accordingly expressed the will of the republic's communists. A most important task now for the Russian Federation Communist Party is the preparation of a detailed program of action, and active engagement in implementing it. This would provide the possibility, even from the first steps, of asserting ourselves and stating our presence in full voice.

We see the prime focus of such a program as concentrating on: social protection of citizens, especially in conditions of the introduction of market relations; immediate fulfilment of the workers' mandates to take measures strengthen production, technological, and executive discipline; realizing the collective farmers' hopes in the countryside's social re-organization and the establishment of equivalent exchange with the towns; realizing the intelligentsia's aspirations for Russia's spiritual regeneration and the formation of the most favorable conditions for the development of talent; on the creation of most-favored status for youth, whose innovative and creative gumption, to our great misfortune, which perestroyka has not yet claimed.

A resolute intensification is needed in the fight against crime, the level of which continues to grow threateningly. We have to elaborate effective measures for improving the social condition of veterans of war and labor, women, and children. As early as the coming months the party has to prove that it is seriously the party of democratic action and humanist creation, and not of irresponsible promises and verbal [word indistinct].

The working people will only understand us and support us if they see the result of the activity of every party cell, and every rayon and oblast organization. This will actually be a business-like enhancement of the party's authority and an embodiment of the party masses' real power. Such a task for the CPSU can be successfully implemented through the communists working in the soviets, state establishments, the mass media, through an enhancement of their philosophical training and, of course, through personal responsibility for our common affairs.

No one is yet on top of this area of our party work. It is total virgin land. Party practice is awaiting answers to the question: How are the gorkom, the raykom, and the primary organization to work afresh in contemporary conditions? At the moment there are more questions than answers. For this reason one would like to invite all communists and those without party affiliation to carefully ponder this problem which, I think, should be a fundamental element in the Russian Federation Communist Party's action program.

The important thing for Russia's future will be unity, unity of the people, unity of the country, unity of the party. I wish to stress this particuarly since communists in individual party organizations in the City of Moscow have been deluded or denied an understanding of the fact that the RSFSR Communist Party is one of the CPSU's republican party organizations, that it uses the same party cards and has the same program and rules. Its organizational formation has taken place, which will unquestionably augment the strength and improve the coordination of the Russian party organizations' actions. This is what is most feared by those who are attacking the CPSU. That is why they have kicked up such a fuss.

At this forum there is probably no need to remind you that our constituent congress was the target of these frenzied and improper polemics. The echoes of this quarrel have reached here, to this hall, as well. You have heard about this. There is no reason for us to let ourselves be pushed subserviently onto the road of schism, which has already been pioneered by pilots whose names are not unfamiliar. One can only regret the fact that these people still belong to the ranks of those who are in charge of implementing perestroyka.

Today you will not find anybody in this hall or anywhere else who is against reform. No one wants to return to the past now. The country expects us to provide it not only with the truth about the past but also with stability in the present and confidence about the future, to remove the barrier between words and deeds which has always been a problem for us. There is only one solution, to find an answer to the following questions as quickly as possible: What must we do, and how? How are we going to live in a new way? How are we going to act, and go on acting? Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Gennadiy Pershin Speech

LD0707111590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1940 GMT 6 Jul 90

["Excerpts" of speech by Gennadiy Alekseyevich Pershin at the 6 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] The party today is in a complex and difficult position. [passage omitted]

However lamentable it is, I believe that party has not had and still does not have a mechanism for personal responsibility for particular matters. What we have is collegial responsibility, and as a rule, it becomes personal only after the deaths of party leaders. For example, I have not encountered in the press decisions, resolutions, or other party documents signed by a specific person: these decisions are always adopted in the name of the CPSU Central Committee or in the name of the Politburo. The country's communists and the people are right today to demand that all members of the Politburo and the Central Committee account for the mistakes and errors which have today brought the country and the party to the edge of the abyss. Why have the specific names of those who bear the guilt for this breakdown not been heard now, either at the Russian congress or now? After all, the anti-alcohol campaign alone inflicted losses on the country amounting to many billions, but it has still not been said openly who, specifically, is guilty and who, specifically, has been punished for undermining of this power's economy in such a way. [passage omitted]

Comrade delegates! I should not like you to form the opinion that I have built my speech mainly on criticism in order to gain political prestige from it, as they say nowadays. I am a rank-and-file working-class communist, and I am not interested in that. But it is a pity that there is no mention now of the fact that those who are now being criticized by the people have developed such a powerful immunity to criticism that sometimes no kind of criticism gets through them. In any new matter, in any construction of something new, progress will be evident where there is change in the apparatus, where there is an influx of new and fresh forces. Therefore, while paying all due respect to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his attempt to transform society, I believe we need fresh and new forces both in his team and in the top echelon of both the party and the state leadership. Comrades, I am for party unity and for the consolidation of all forces and currents which encourage the unification and prestige of the party, but it will be impossible to achieve that without radical changes in the leadership and in the approach to leadership in the party. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Ilin Gives Secretariat Report to Congress

LD0607224890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1300 GMT 6 Jul 90

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The chairman at the evening session [of the CPSU congress] then gave the floor to the leader of the congress Secretariat, A.N. Ilin, who informed the delegates of the work done over the last four days. In particular, at its daily sessions the Secretariat examined requests for permission to speak, for distribution of official alternative documents, appeals by delegates, and incoming correspondence from collectives and individual citizens, addressed to the congress. Informational methodological help was given to delegates.

Six associations of delegates were formed at the congress and registered by the Secretariat. Among them were the groups "Soviets", "Young Communists", "Delegates Supporting the Democratic Platform of the CPSU", a workers' group, and others.

The delegates played an active part in drawing up and editing the main documents of the congress. In all, more than 1,000 suggestions and comments were received concerning the draft charter, the program statement of the 28th CPSU Congress, its resolutions and addresses. All of them were forwarded urgently to the editing and other commissions.

The leader of the Secretariat reported that the work of drawing up the lists of speakers was extremely complicated. About 2,000 requests to be given the floor were registered. Altogether, including contributions from the microphones, about 400 congress participants put their points of view.

The 28th CPSU Congress continues to receive many letters and telegrams from party organizations, labor collectives, communists, and nonparty members. All the mail addressed to the congress is being examined by the secretariat as a matter of first priority, and reported to the presidium. Among the letters received are many appeals requesting that particular economic questions be examined. There are also complaints. All have been forwarded to the appropriate places for consideration. The secretariat informed the delegates that the personal reception of citizens is taking place in the reception office of the CPSU Central Committee, the address of which is: 22 Kuybyshev Street, entrance 11. There too, the reception of letters to the CPSU Central Committee, including those addressed to the congress, has been organized. During the days when the congress has been in session, extra measures have been taken in organizing the reception of citizens.

The speaker reported that materials are being circulated at the congress which have not been examined by the Secretariat—and not always for respectable purposes. Cited as an example was the leaflet of the "Democratic Union"—a malicious lampoon against the CPSU. It goes without saying that this is not conducive to the normal conduct of the party forum, and does not show the organizers and perpetrators of such actions in the best light. [passage omitted]

Radio Cites Marxist Platform's Buzgalin

LD0607140890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 6 Jul 90

[Speech by Aleksandr Buzgalin, lecturer at Moscow State University, for the Marxist Platform, at 28th CPSU Congress in Moscow Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 6 July—recorded]

[Text] Our task is to prove to communists that only the democratization of the party and the country will secure our movement along the road of socialist choice and a communist future. We shall not achieve success without this consistent and resolute democratization; the people will turn away from us. The answer to the challenge of our times must be given seriously and strictly. We are tired, and slogans and emotions are arousing tumultuous applause in the hall. Many delegates are complaining about the serious situation, and there are indeed groans coming from the rostrum of this congress and its sections.

But is this the problem, however hard things are for us? I think the problem is that we need a precise, strict, scientific Marxist analysis, which starts from an analysis of the contradictions in our society, and from an emphasis on what is going on here. We are all quick to agree that we have a totalitarian and bureaucratic system which has used the cement of violence to bind together the most heterogenous layers: bits of socialism, bits of state capitalism, and even semi-feudal relations. What is going on today, beneath all that? Today, this system is decomposing, and the stench of this decomposition is poisoning the first fresh air of freedom which we started breathing literally a few years ago.

Where are we to go in these conditions? What should we choose? Some people say: That's enough. There's a very strong smell already. Let's go back. Let us tighten the screws and not surrender our ideals. That is a very attractive slogan, especially to those who have given the party their lives, their talent, and their energy. But will we not be going back to a dead end from, which there will be no way out at all? Others say; no, let us do it differently. Let us proceed along the course of civilized countries, by practically introducing their platforms into our life today. What will we get in that event? In the best case, we'll get an India, where there are nuclear missile complexes and hundreds of millions of people who are semi-destitute, even by our Soviet standards. But there is also the threat of a Pinochet-style dictatorship, where the U.S. adviser Friedman will develop the ideas of private enterprise and a free market under the patronage of new bloody dictators.

So, what can we do, all the same? There is a third way. Yes, there is, and it does not lie in the middle, as many leaders of our party are proposing. It lies in going beyond the others, as has already been said at this Congress, in moving along the road to the economy, politics, and structure of 21st century social forces.

Information Report on 6 July Proceedings

PM0607211390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

["Information Report on 28th CPSU Congress Proceedings"]

[Text] The 28th CPSU Congress continued its work 6 July 1989 in Moscow's Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

The morning plenary sitting was chaired by G.G. Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Debates resumed at the congress on the questions under discussion. The following addressed the sitting's participants: P.K. Luchinskiy, Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; Ye.V. Maksimov, writer, Smolensk Oblast; V.A. Gayvoronskiy, arc welder from Donetsk Oblast's "Azovmash" Production Association; A.P. Rubiks, Latvian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; M.T. Kabelkova, head of department at Abakan State Pedagogical Institute, Khakassy Autonomous Oblast; D.N. Kugultinov, writer and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Kalmyk ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]; A.M. Masaliyev, Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee first secretary and chairman of the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet; L.D. Zakovryashina, leasehold calf herd at "Borovoy" Sovkhoz [State Farm], Altay Kray; K. Makhkamov, Tajik Communist Party Central Committee first secretary and chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet; M.A. Ulyanov, chairman of the Board of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Union of Theater Workers and artistic director at Moscow's Yevg. Vakhtangov State Academy Theater; V.M. Movsisyan, Armenian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet; S.A. Niyazov, Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee first secretary and chairman of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet; B.A. Kustov, general director of the West Siberian metallurgical combine named for the 50th anniversary of Great October, Kemerovo Oblast; V.M. Zyukin, first secretary of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee; V.I. Potapov, first secretary of Irkutsk CPSU Oblast Party Committee and chairman of the oblast soviet of people's deputies; A.V. Buzgalin, from the Marxist Platform in the CPSU and associate professor in the economic faculty at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow.

P.K. Luchinskiy, Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, chaired the evening sitting.

The following took part in the debate: V.N. Shostakovskiy from the Democratic Platform in the CPSU and rector at Moscow Higher Party School; A.A. Sergeyev from the Initiative Congress of Russian Communists and head of department at the Shvernik Higher School of the Trade Union Movement.

A.N. Ilin, leader of the Congress Secretariat, then delivered a report on the nature of the letters and appeals made to the 28th CPSU Congress.

L.N. Kravchenko, head of the group dealing with the press, gave explanations and made concrete proposals regarding the critical comments about the insufficiently broad and in a number of cases biased mass media coverage of the congress' work.

The debates then continued. The following spoke at the congress: G.I. Yanayev, AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] chairman; Ch. Aytmatov, writer and editor in chief of the INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA journal, Kirghiz SSR; E.-A.A. Sillari, Estonian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; I.K. Polozkov, RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; G.A. Pershin, electrician at the "Bratskgorstroy" Design and Construction Association Power Mechanization Administration, Irkutsk Oblast; V.S. Belousov, team leader at a cement plant in Semipalatinsk; L.P. Rodionova, supervisor at Kalinin's "Khimvolokno" Production Association, Kalinin Oblast.

TASS Summarizes 6 July Congress

LD0707162490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 6 Jul 90

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Delegates A.S. Kamay, A.D. Lizichev and Ch. T. Aytmatov, the heads of the commissions set up by the congress to prepare resolutions on a political assessment of the progress in clearing up the aftermath of the Chernobyl incident, on the basic guidelines of military policy, and on interethnic issues, then reported on the formation of the commissions and their membership. The congress agreed with the proposed list of candidates.

At the end of the day, as is now traditional, the delegates were given two or three minutes to speak from the rostrum on the microphones. One of the proposals made during these quickfire debates was to return again to the examination of the matter of the degree of responsibility of former party leaders for the current situation in the party and the country. The chair recalled that the Congress Secretariat had already studied that statement and proposed that it be examined by the newly formed Central Control Commission. The proposal gave rise to a debate, but in the end, the hall accepted it by a majority vote.

The "microphone discussion" covered a variety of subjects. The delegates felt that the system by which economists and economic managers are trained should be reviewed, with young people being sent abroad to study for these purposes, and that an opportunity should be sought to find resources to reinforce the services of the internal affairs bodies in the republics to enable them to restore order by their own efforts. The speakers expressed opposition to the depoliticization of the Army, and said the people should be told the truth about the Semipalatinsk testing ground.

Delegate G.V. Podzorova requested two and one-half minutes to speak on behalf of the teaching profession. She recalled once again the sad facts about the disastrous situation of schools and teachers and about society's disregard for these problems. She demanded that the congress draw up a serious resolution on national education.

The congress continues on 7 July.

PRAVDA Reviews 6 July Congress Session

PM0707153590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by special correspondents N.Kozhanov, Yu. Makhrin, B. Naumov, A. Shinkin: "Chronicle of the Congress, Day Five"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Member of the Presidential Council V. Yarin had a calm approach to events at the congress:

"Society is seething. And our congress is seething with emotion. I have an equally cautious attitude both to those who are in a hurry and also to those who shout "Help!" more loudly than everyone else. There is nothing good in haste or in panic, as we well know. It seems to me that emotions have been aroused by relapses into the old way of thinking among certain delegates, who say, how is it that yesterday I simply dictated my will on behalf of the party and everyone obeyed, yet today...

"These relapses were manifested particularly distinctly at M.S. Gorbachev's recent meeting with city [gorkom] and rayon party committee [raykom] secretaries. How many unjustified complaints, to put it bluntly, were heaped on him, such as: 'He has wrecked the party,' and so on. It was he who took upon himself the very heavy burden of worries and who is sincerely trying to improve our lives. Party workers must not unload their responsibility onto the leadership."

And what is happening in the country? Here are some shots of the capital. Muscovites and visitors to the capital approach the delegates at the "Rossiya" hotel and in the Kremlin squares. Discussions continue even here. We see M.S. Gorbachev surrounded by a crowd of people in Ivanov Square in the Kremlin. There is a plethora of questions and rejoinders...

"We in Uzbekistan have kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective and state farms]—and this is the best system."

M.S. Gorbachev:

"But after all, this does not contradict the fact that you were one of the first in the country to become involved in family contracts. This offends the 'generals' of agriculture, because it seems that people want to undermine them, although they organized matters well. But you know, every kolkhoz needs a driving force and stimuli!" [passage omitted]

Yakovlev Not To Run for Politburo

LD0607213890 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 6 Jul 90

[Text] A member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, Aleksandr Yakovlev, has said he is not going to contest this post any longer.

He voiced this decision in a conversation with delegates to the 28th party congress in which he has been taking an active part.

Aleksandr Yakovlev noted that he would continue to work in the Presidential Council, a new state body formed through political reform in the USSR.

Gorbachev Meets Party Secretaries 6 July

LD0707185490 Moscow TASS in English 1850 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS—The democratisation of the party, the setting of the party's priorities, the degree of the subordination of communists to resolutions adopted by a party meeting or a conference, as well as other burning problems were discussed at a meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev with secretaries of primary party organisations—delegates to the 28th party congress (there are about 500 of them at the congress). The meeting was held on July 6.

The delegates set the tone of the conversation. It was pointed out that many delegates have not decided so far what position to assume and are closely following resolutions put forward by Gorbachev. They trust them and check their own stands with them. The general secretary was asked to approve the versions of resolutions which are expected by representatives of primary party organisations, not by officials from the Central Committee apparatus. Gorbachev answered: "Previously, at a Supreme Soviet session, I was criticised for participating in a discussion. This time the opposite remark was made. I believe that one should always act depending on a concrete situation."

Speaking about the party's democratisation which, judging by statements of the delegates, is the central idea at the congress, Gorbachev stressed that it would be put into practice through the transfer of power to rank-and-file party members, to primary party organizations. There are no problems that communists cannot resolve on their own. The idea that democratisation boils down to the right to admit new members or to expel people from the party is just groundless.

Problems of the party's personnel policy evoked a special and natural interest. Responding to the question about the reason for a shortage of bright personalities in the party, Gorbachev said: "I think, there will be enough of them in the near future." His statement that more representatives of primary party organisations will be elected to the Central Committee were welcomed by the audience.

The question was asked at the meeting where consolidation between Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin was possible and on what terms. Gorbachev said that Yeltsin's speech at the congress puzzled him. He put forward some unacceptable ideas, specifically, depolitisation, the transfer of the party's property and so on. "And still I believe that we shall find ways to agreement with Boris Yeltsin. The destiny of the party, the country and perestroyka, on which people are pinning their hopes, comes first with me. This is beyond any personal differences for me."

PRAVDA on Meeting

PM0807124190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 90 Second Edition pp 1,7

[TASS report: "Getting Down to the Truth. Reportage on M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With Primary Party Organization Secretaries"]

[Text] It is hard for delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress to find any free time. Their workday is packed to the limit—the sessions are interspersed with trips to ministries and various organizations, meetings and discussions with Muscovites, and visits to the capital's sites of historical and revolutionary interest. It is quite understandable that the envoys from the country's party organizations are also keeping in contact with their collectives, contacting their homes almost daily, inquiring about work, and carrying out their comrades' various instructions. Their time is extremely tight.

Of course, there is a sense of fatigue. But the delegates who came to the 6 July meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, setting aside all their evening work, were unusually harmonious. The motives were perfectly understandable. After all, many unresolved problems have built up for the guests, and meetings between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and primary party organization secretaries—and there are more than 500 of them at the congress—are not that common: To be frank, this was the first such meeting.

There was immense interest in the meeting. Suffice it to say that a Kremlin auditorium with 800 places was chockablock, additional seats had to be set out, and people were invited to fill the empty seats in the presidium. Thus, this immediately unconstrained atmosphere was conducive to a frank and open discussion. Moreover, an unusual feature of the event was perhaps the fact that ordinary congress delegates were alongside Mikhail Sergeyevich in the presidium, while Central Committee secretaries and other party leaders were in the auditorium among the guests.

The tone of the discussion was set by the delegates themselves. Their brief monologues naturally reflected the sentiments of the recently ended congress session, but at the same time they supplemented the assessments and judgments expressed at it with their own thoughts and observations. The discussion was about serious and vital things—for instance, the different interpretations of questions such as party democracy, the priority of the CPSU's next steps, and the level of communists' subordination to the decisions made by party assemblies or conferences. Many other urgent problems were discussed as well. That is entirely understandable. Communists now are primarily concerned about the fate of the party, few of them are not trying to find answers to the questions raised by life—such as how things are going in the CPSU and in what ways it should be really renewed.

Explaining why such a large audience had assembled in the auditorium at such a late hour, A.F. Mironyuk, party committee secretary at Moscow's "Soyuz" Science and Production Association, said:

"Many Congress delegates have still not made their minds up about their positions. They are attentively following the decisions proposed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, they trust them, and they take their cue from them."

His request to the general secretary was somewhat unexpected: That the sort of decisions expected by the primary party organization representatives be adopted, rather than the sort expected by Central Committee apparatus staffers.

"In one case, at the Supreme Soviet, I was criticized for butting into the discussion. Today the opposite remark has been made. But I believe that everything should be determined by the specific situation," M.S. Gorbachev reacted.

What is the main thing for the party now? Differing opinions or unanimity, complete unity or different platforms?... Both in the Palace of Congresses and here at the meeting it was hard to find a common denominator on this issue. And yet people strove to do so. Perhaps the clearest statement was made by L.R. Pigan, party committee secretary at a military unit administration:

"We are at the base of our party hierarchy and you are the general [secretary]. We should not be at odds, we should be united."

It seems that the quest for these principled positions, in determining which (even if on the whole the platforms are different!) the congress must absolutely achieve a concerted viewpoint, turned into a kind of supreme task for the meeting. That is why it was not so much feeling its way toward positions as working out an already specific action program which, if adopted at the congress, will have a renewing influence on the fate of the CPSU. The overwhelming majority of the proposals voiced during the three-minute speeches were businesslike and constructive. Here are just some of them: to extend party forum delegates' mandates to five years, to legislatively enshrine the possibility of parties and social organizations operating within the USSR Constitution being represented at enterprises, and to cooperate more closely with democratic movements.

The meeting's participants expressed the wish that everything valuable in the communists' speeches should be somehow generalized and taken into account in practical work.

All the delegates had their own views of what is happening in the party. That is why the analysis of the situation was not identical.

"Power should be transferred to the primary organizations," S.A. Kamyshev, party committee secretary at the Ye.T. Abakumov Pit in Donetsk, addressed those present. "But we should also take account of the fact that our political rivals have changed their tactics and, instead of making feverish attempts to set up their own parties, are directing all their efforts into bringing about the downfall of CPSU primary organizations. They are perfectly well aware that if they destroy the foundations, the whole edifice will crumble."

Expressing the views of many of those in the auditorium, he advised Mikhail Sergeyevich to "move to the left" as general secretary and to "move to the right" as president.

V.S. Zaytsev of Murmansk Oblast spoke with sadness of the continuing resignation of party members from the CPSU, tying this process in with the inadequate pace of party democratization. A.S. Gorostovatov of Odessa considered it necessary to point to the loss of collegiality in the party: The solution is to reinforce leading organs with people who are real leaders. A.O. Varinov of Chita proposed giving real thought right now to the person who should be given the post of number two in the CPSU.

The directness and frankness of the discussion with the general secretary by no means prompted the thought that the sharpness of certain assessments and expressions was deliberate. It was rather a question of the strong desire to express really sore points, to be heard, and, above all, to focus the auditorium's attention on the acute problems of the party and society without abusing the opportunity to demonstrate one's skills as a speaker.

The delegates had many questions on the most varied aspects of life. That is why M.S. Gorbachev's replies to them were a kind of excursion into history and an overview of the crisis situation prevailing in society at present and the ways of getting out of it.

Talking about the idea of party democratization, which—judging by the rejoinders from the Congress delegates—is now essentially fundamental, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stressed that it will be possible to implement this idea through the transfer of power to the party masses. This is a key avenue. Clearly, the Statutes should not list the things that primary organizations can do—they can do everything. And there are no issues which communists could not resolve independently. The thesis that democratization boils down to the right to accept people into or expel people from the CPSU is simply groundless.

The many written requests and questions asked by the emissaries of the country's communists via the microphones set up in the auditorium were more like proposals for thinking out loud. Despite the fact that their subjects were wide-ranging and diverse—from the mechanism for transferring power to the party masses and the implementation of control functions by top party organs to specific questions of the work of the 28th Congress and attitudes to the combination of posts—Mikhail Sergeyevich, accepting the communists' desire to speak heart to heart in a comradely fashion, gave detailed and extensive answers as a rule. And this was understood by the meeting participants: You will agree that it is not easy to get down to the truth in the midst of the multitude of views voiced at the Congress. All the more so since, as one of the speakers said, the Congress sessions have not yet gotten around to a businesslike discussion of the party's problems in a constructive spirit. There have been many speeches and all of them have been on vital topics. But the time of sincere and open dialogue has not yet arrived.

The answers to the questions filled, as it were, the vacuum which is probably inevitable in meetings of many thousands of people such as the party forum.

The problems of the party's cadre policy were of particular and natural interest. Answering a question on how to explain the lack of vivid personalities in the party, M.S. Gorbachev said: In my opinion, there will be plenty of them in the very near future. The auditorium's positive reaction to these words could be seen as an instance of coinciding expectations on this issue between the primary party organization secretaries and their interlocutor, who has devoted a great deal of time to the party's intellectual potential. We will strive without fail to include more workers at your level within the Central Committee, the general secretary said. It seems that he too found much that was interesting and instructive in this frank discussion. At any rate, the names of a number of comrades cited by the meeting participants for nomination as party leaders will clearly generate a corresponding response.

In this respect the question of whether consolidation between M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin is possible and under what conditions, was typical. Mikhail Sergeyevich said that Boris Nikolayevich's speech at the Congress had puzzled him. It included a number of unacceptable points—depoliticization, the transfer of party property, and so forth. And yet, Mikhail Sergeyevich said, I think that we will find ways of reaching agreement [puti soglasiya] with B.N. Yeltsin. For me the fate of the party, the country, and perestroyka—on which the people are pinning their hopes and aspirations—comes first. For me this comes above any personal differences.

Privilege... This is an acute and long-standing subject. It was decided at the party congress to set up a commission to examine matters concerning privilege. The meeting participants did not sidestep this problem either. Mikhail Sergeyevich said, in particular, that dachas which had previously been occupied by ranking party workers have now been or are being handed over to veterans or for use as kindergartens or health facilities. Fixed rates of pay have been set, flights on "personal" aircraft have been abolished, and a number of other restrictions have been brought in.

The meeting did not end with the adoption of any resolution. But its participants left—and probably on both sides—imbued with new ideas and thoughts. They reacted with understanding to the general secretary's address, which called on them to enliven party life at local level and to do everything to ensure that all communists—workers, peasants, and representatives of the intelligentsia—feel that primary organizations are their own organizations and that they will find them interesting. If this is the case they will not be inclined to leave them—and the question of resignations from the party was one of the key and most alarming points at the meeting. It is they—the Congress delegates—who will have to give powerful impetus to renewal and to party reform.

Secretaries Heckle Gorbachev

PM0707191990 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 7 Jul 90 pp 1, 2

[Chief Editor Anatoliy Yurkov "Editor's Opinion": "Incident Closed?"]

[Text] "Unless you remove the television cameras from the auditorium, our discussion is off!"

The ultimatum stunned everyone who had assembled in the Grand Kremlin Palace. The voice of the general secretary struggled to make itself heard over the hubbub of voices expressing approval or anger:

"What about glasnost?"

But the hubbub in the auditorium became even louder. A young secretary of a Moscow Raykom [rayon committee] was sitting next to me. He glanced at me in astonishment: What was going on? I just shrugged, for the microphone in the auditorium had added a further thunderclap to the ultimatum:

"Remove all outsiders from the auditorium!"

I was an "outsider," since secretaries of the country's gorkoms [city committees] and raykoms taking part in the 28th CPSU Congress were meeting in the Grand Kremlin Palace. They had come to meet and talk with the general secretary of our party's Central Committee.

But I did not want to leave, my profession is glasnost and it obliges me to serve it to the last. And this profession has trained me not to regard myself as an outsider even at conferences discussing secret operations. And also I thought: Doesn't this attitude toward the mass media shape a certain attitude among journalists toward the party apparatus?

My offended television colleagues tried to protest, but they weren't allowed to get to the microphone and anything that was said "unaided" was drowned out by the hubbub in the hall.

I will confess: I felt uncomfortable. Because the general secretary ostentatiously left the chairman's seat under pressure of the emotions that rained upon him from the audience. Of course, it was not easy for Mikhail Sergeyevich after three days of an extremely tense congress, and he too is only human. But things are even hotter at the rallies that the people sitting in the auditorium face almost everyday. Of course, that is no argument (indeed, especially no argument) to justify such discourteous behavior, but, even so, the general secretary ought to have understood his raykom and gorkom colleagues and to have been more magnanimous. He ought to have understood them and listened patiently while they got things off their chests.

He certainly ought to have realized that, despite everything, the majority of people in the auditorium were sincere supporters of constructive renewal, or, to be blunt, supporters of Gorbachev and his reforms. It was simply that the others were more aggressive and more vocal, pushed everyone into the background, and were able to create the appearance of universal obstruction. It would be a pity if television journalists and, taking their cue from them, most journalists were to judge all raykom and gorkom secretaries on the basis of their conduct, categorizing them wholesale as members of the conservative camp.

The people sitting in the hall, most of whom had been promoted by perestroyka, including via its harsh process of selection, where rally terror is by no means the most pitiless ordeal—those people needed to frankly reveal their ideas and concerns. So that not even a shadow of diktat would cause anyone to frown. And the harsh wave of emotions from the audience should have been countered with a screen of restraint, amicability, and constructive dialogue, which Mikhail Sergeyevich knows how to conduct so masterfully with any audience. First captivating them, then winning them over with the charm of his personality.

I am sincerely sorry that this time the dialogue turned out differently.

I will confess again: I felt uncomfortable at this meeting right from the start, uncomfortable at the behavior of a section of the audience which had inflamed itself with grievances to the point of forgetting elementary truths. Uncomfortable at the heckling that accompanied the general secretary's answers. For the first time during the congress I felt a doubt: Did the people sitting around me really support perestroyka?

Just imagine: The general secretary is explaining a fundamental change in the raykom's life, in the balance of power, in the political situation nowadays. He says that now there has been a qualitative change in the situation, today you cannot order people about, and the raykom must seek and take on board new methods of influencing the course of events—via people. After all, the raykom agent used to be a real somebody: A director would go to see him and stand to attention in front of him...

"That was real power!" a raykom secretary sitting a couple of rows in front of me retorts.

Answering a typical written question about the division of power within the rayon, Mikhail Sergeyevich says that we are forever arguing about who is more important—the soviet chairman or the raykom first secretary... But a rejoinder from the audience interrupts him:

"You did a stupid thing, you legitimized an artificial structure, and now we're in a mess—no one will listen to us..."

"So it's okay for you to hold two posts, but not for us?"

Gorbachev comments on the most subtle point: We are coming under fire because we tied everything to ourselves—from nails to missiles. But this is an impossible burden, you cannot carry it. So wherever there is a problem or a failure, we come under fire.

"Why don't you defend the party?"

Mikhail Sergeyevich explains what defending the party now means. It means renewing it in the broadest sense of the word. Only a renewed party will not need to be defended, the people will accept and acknowledge it.

"Renewal has gone far enough—you can't build a new gorkom building," is the rejoinder.

These selective illustrations of mine may not fully convey the dominant mood in the auditorium. The periods of really businesslike, sensible constructive discussion were knocked out of their stride by regular bursts of emotion and did not lead to a fruitful debate, in which both ideas and ideologists emerge.

The diktat from the audience, which was threatening to give the entire Central Committee and therefore the entire policy of perestroyka a "fail," prompted a warning from the presidium: Surely it is clear what consequences this would entail. The warning prompted further diktat...

By the end of the meeting passions had subsided, but it looked as though there was no greater degree of mutual understanding. The next day, when I tried to investigate in greater depth the reasons for this behavior by the participants in the meeting, one of my interlocutors said:

"Let Gorbachev make his position clear."

"In what respect has the general secretary not done so, in your view?"

"He should say whether or not he is in favor of perestroyka."

"Yes," I said, "it's really time Gorbachev made things clear. After all, it's five years since he initiated perestroyka."

He did not notice my tone of voice and continued:

"Whose side is he ultimately on—the radicals' or?.."

"What about you?"

"I'm not the point—the party is the point."

And I realized that he is precisely the whole point. And the same goes for the party too, of course, since the party is him, you, me, each one of us. And the general secretary too. That way round, not the reverse. Provided that we have really seriously arrived, via a difficult quest and profound and painful reflection in analyzing the errors of the past, at the conclusion that our renewed party places the interests of man at the center of its world outlook. Both radicals and conservatives. Everyone, regardless of their political sympathies and religious convictions.

My interlocutor thought for a moment:

"Do you mean that the general secretary cannot be on any side?"

"I mean that he must not promote a split among communists. So far as all the rest is concerned, I think Mikhail Sergeyevich has made his position clear."

From our long conversation I later learned that my interlocutor's attitude too was understandable. He had been driven to distraction: At one moment the Central Committee publishes a letter urging that the Democratic Platform diehards be brought to heel, at the next it incorporates their proposals in the congress program document. At one moment it proclaims that the party's strength lies in the raykoms' strength, at the next it leaves them without financial support. And he cannot decide for himself how to earn money or what is to become of the radicals.

Yes, after all, he is the point. It is one thing to head a raykom at the height of perestroyka. It is quite another to conduct an independent policy of renewal. You can renew the entire apparatus of a party committee but it will still remain as it was before, capable of working only on instructions from the center.

The tension that arose at the very start of the meeting was not smoothed out until the end. Is this going to make its mark on the results of the congress? It ought not to. Those who took part in the meeting do indeed hold in their hands the party's strength, its life. They are wise people, they must realize that if one strength smashes another, all that is left are people who are unfit to work. Or cripples.

After reading these remarks, someone may choose to exploit them for different purposes. Don't listen to him—he is a malicious person. I was not an outsider at that meeting—I was a concerned citizen. For my party, for my paper, for my family. And for the honor of a communist who repudiated his comrades, one of whom was calling on people to "close ranks" and "issue orders." And also for the honor of the general secretary, which we are all called upon to protect. Not according to the law, but according to conscience. And sometimes [protect it] even from himself.

I think that someone who felt the same way as we do at that meeting was the raykom secretary who stood up and said: I protest at the attitude that the people sitting alongside me are displaying, Mikhail Sergeyevich, believe me, not everyone thinks that way. I feel ashamed, and I am walking out.

And he slammed the door of the Grand Kremlin Palace.

Of course, it is almost a historic action to slam that door. But what will be the reverberations of that noise in our ranks? For the party expects wise decisions and consolidation of forces from the congress.

Congress News Conference Views World Issues

LD0607204490 Moscow TASS in English 2030 GMT 6 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov—"News Conference by Party Congress delegates"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—During the question and answer period, Dzasokhov said that the forthcoming visit to the USSR by NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner will be "implemented in line with the communique on the results of the NATO Council's session in London."

He added that any contacts between representatives of military and political blocs are productive.

Commenting on the NATO summit, Falin noted that the NATO doctrine of "flexible response," in fact, remains in force after the London summit. At the same time he described the session's results as a "movement in the right direction."

Dealing with criticism of the Soviet foreign policy by the Soviet military, Falin said that "critics speaking at the congress in the conditions of pluralism on these issues do not reflect the opinion of the majority in the Soviet Armed Forces.

"They do not play the decisive role in drafting the activity of the Defence Ministry, let alone the drafting of the Soviet military policy which is worked out by the Defence Council with the president's participation."

Turning to a Middle East settlement, Dzasokhov called U.S. passivity in diplomatic and other respects as a "component of stagnation" in this area.

He also pointed to an important role which the United Nations Security Council could play in settling this problem.

Speaking of contacts between the CPSU and communist, revolutionary-democratic and socialist parties and movements, Falin said that the CPSU preserves "good relations with the overwhelming majority of communist parties and that it maintains relations with social democratic and socialist parties."

He expressed opinion that the CPSU will maintain these contact which will be useful in gaining experience of work in the conditions of a multi-party system.

Dealing with prospects for achieving a Soviet-American agreement on chemical weapons, Dzasokhov noted that "it is possible to forecast an efficient advance" in this sphere in the near future.

Touching on Soviet relations with Cuba and People's Korea, the two speakers stressed that the USSR does not intend "to be a teacher" of those countries.

"The freedom of choice" is a principle on which the USSR builds its relations with those states. One should not meddle in the affairs of other countries, he added.

Speaking specifically about Cuba, Dzasokhov noted that he does not see any grounds for raising ballyhoo about Soviet-Cuban relations. The two countries have extensive trade and economic interests, he noted.

Dzasokhov pointed to Cuba's role in the non-aligned movement, Soviet-Cuban actions in the international arena as well as moral aspects of the Soviet-Cuban relations, including the treatment in Cuba of 10,000 Soviet children who suffered during the Chernobyl disaster.

More on News Conference

LD0607192690 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 6 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—The USSR's course for the improvement of international relations will be supported by the current congress of the Soviet Communist Party, high-ranking party official Valentin Falin told a news conference at the press centre of the 28th CPSU Congress today.

He held the news conference together with Aleksandr Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs, after the fifth day of the Congress of Soviet Communists.

Falin said that the activity of the CPSU Central Committee in the international arena and talks conducted by the Soviet Government draw the attention of communists and the majority of Soviet people, since the decades of the development of the international situation depend on decisions which will be made today.

People ask how well-balanced concluded agreement are and how Soviet "concessions" are balanced with reciprocal steps by the United States and the West, he noted.

Some Soviet people believe that the international situation is being improved at the expense of the USSR's unilateral moves.

Noting that the Soviet leadership "makes explanations, cites facts and arguments" on this point, Falin noted that these questions arise due to the fact that the Soviet people "are fully determined to prevent a repetition" of a tragic period in history connected with the Second World War.

Dzasokhov noted that international relations featured prominently in the report by party Genral Secretary and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev as well as in reports by three members of the Central Committee Politburo at the congress.

According to Dzasokhov, the above reports helped understand better these problems and determined the need "to take steps after the congress to bring the entire range of present and future party and political relations of the CPSU in line with new political thinking and renewed ideas in this sphere".

Democratic Platform Gives News Conference

PM0707182590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jul 90 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel S. Pashayev report: "No Sensations. News Conference of the 'Democratic Platform Within the CPSU'"]

[Text] "Democratic Platform Within the CPSU" representatives held a short news conference in the Moscow Movie Center's premises in the evening of 6 July. Those journalists who had been expecting some sensations were, to put it bluntly, disappointed. There was mainly talk of the already well known assessments by the Democratic Platform leadership of the ongoing party congress. In their opinion, it is taking place according to a rigid scenario. True, by contrast with the Russian party congress, criticism of the leadership is somewhat muted here. Speakers unanimously predicted a future exodus of party members from the CPSU, at the same time admitting that this process will be complex and lengthy. But, it was declared, in the prevailing situation the Democratic Platform will simply be left with no alternative but to announce secession.

The interest of those present was aroused by a report by Vladimir Lysenko, member of the Democratic Platform Coordinating Council, that representatives of "left-wing and democratic forces" had made an offer to Aleksandr Yakovlev to nominate him for the post of general secretary in the event of the USSR president's issuing a statement on the suspension of his own membership or his withdrawal from the party. It was explained to journalists there that Aleksandr Yakovlev declined, saying that he had decided to concentrate on work on the Presidential Council.

How is the process of secession conceived? USSR People's Deputy Colonel Vladimir Smirnov answered this question. A corresponding statement will be made, and reregistration and the creation of a coordinating council with the task of convening its own congress will be announced.

At the news conference there was also talk of the Army, which, as some people believe, "might be used by right-wing conservative forces." In confirmation of this supposition they cited ... a quote from an emigre newspaper and references to some leaflets which are being distributed in some places. After the end of the news conference I approached Vyacheslav Shostakovskiy, rector of Moscow Higher Party School, and asked him to answer a direct question: Does he himself believe in the possibility of a "Soviet military putsch." "No, I do not believe in the possibility of a military coup," my interlocutor smiled. It is both clear and intelligible, as it were. Why then, one wonders, exaggerate rumors?

Moscow TV Carries 7 July Proceedings

LD0707164590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1615 GMT on 7 July begins carrying a recorded report of the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

The announcer says the work of the seven sections of the congress were to be examined today. Niyazov, Turkmenistan Communist Party first secretary, was in the chair. At the request of Yurchenko, a delegate from Gomel, the aftermath of Chernobyl was addressed. Yurchenko is shown addressing the congress on some of the aftereffects of the disaster; she gives details of damage to the health of children and others living in the area. She goes on to some of the inadequacies in dealing with the situation and makes proposals for improving matters. Then she moves on to some of the problems that have arisen in connection with the evacuations; she criticizes Medvedev briefly. She says people's concern is on the brink of an explosion.

At 1621 GMT Niyazov proposes that each section's representative be given 15 minutes to report on the work of their section.

At 1622 GMT Melnikov, the leader of the section on renewal of the party, takes the floor. The announcer outlines some of the points in his address, and then plays an excerpt of his speech.

At 1624 GMT Ivan Melnikov is shown giving his address. Gorbachev and Lukyanov are seen flanking Niyazov on the platform. *[The text of the report on Melnikov's speech is published below]*

At 1629 GMT an unidentified correspondent introduces an excerpt of the speech by Ivan Frolov as head of the section on ideological work. *[The text of the report on Frolov's speech is published below]*

At 1635 GMT Ukrainian First Secretary Gurenko is tehn shown taking the floor representing the social and economic section. A recorded excerpt of his speech follows. *[The text of the report on Gurenko's speech is published below]*

At 1640 GMT Starodubtsev takes the floor for the agrarian section. An excerpt follows. *[The text of the report on Starodubtsev's speech is published below]*

At 1647 GMT Kuptsov takes the floor for the section on relations between party and soviets and public movements, the work of which is described as fruitful. A recorded excerpt of his speech then follows. Kuptsov notes that along with justified criticism of the ruling party, there are frequent cases of slandering it. He says many delegates have noted that the party accepts that it has made mistakes, but they reject such wholesale blackening of its name. He outlines some of the observations and proposals submitted during the work of the section. He says there were heated arguments surrounding the combination of party and soviet posts. The party has to take account of the new realities, the greater complexity of society. The party, he says, rejects tutelage of the soviets. He says there has to be a renunciation of violence and there has to be mutual respect in relations between parties and public movements. The idea was floated of a commission for cooperation between the party and public movements, he says.

At 1653 GMT an excerpt of a speech for the section on interethnic relations by Andrey Girenko floor is played. *[The text of the report on Girenko's speech is published below]*

At 1701 GMT an excerpt of the speech by Valentin Falin for the section on the party's international policy is shown. *[The text of the report on Falin's speech is published below]*

At 1707 GMT it is decided to end this part of the congress's work and go on to replies by members of the Politburo. Nikolay Ryzhkov is shown on the platform, saying he has 20 minutes to reply to some of the questions he has received; he says he will reply to the rest in written form. He then replies to a number of questions. *[The test of Ryzhkov's recorded remarks is published below]*

At 1721 GMT Vadim Medvedev is shown at the rostrum replying to written questions. *[The text or Medvedev's recorded remarks is published below]*

At 1747 GMT Aleksandr Yakovlev is shown giving a speech and then responding to questions from the congress floor. *[The text of Yakovlev's speech and remarks is published below]*

At 1812 GMT the television announcer says the congress set up a privileges commission. The announcer says Yegor Ligachev then replied to questions. Ligachev is then shown on the rostrum answering questions. *[The text of Ligachev's recorded remarks are published below]*

At 1837 GMT Eduard Shevardnadze is shown giving a speech, followed by a question and answer session. *[The text of Shevardnadze's recorded speech and remarks is published below]*

At 1904 GMT Gorbachev says that there have been many questions handed in. He reads out two suggestions against returning to the responsibility of Politburo members. He reads out an Azeri poem which expounds the wisdom of quiet words. He asks who is for ceasing the reports of the Politburo members: 3,078 vote for and 1,113 against.

At 1910 GMT Vladimir Ivashko is shown speaking for the editorial commission on the congress documents. The agenda has been affirmed, he says. *[The text of Ivashko's recorded remarks is published below]*

At 1931 GMT the announcer says a broad debate ensued. Delegates are seen speaking from microphones, but there is no audio.

At 1932 GMT Gorbachev is seen and heard to propose that the drafting commission spend tomorrow morning looking again at its document, taking into account today's comments. Other commissions are also to meet tomorrow.

At 1938 GMT the recorded report ends.

Moscow TV on 7 July Congress Speeches

Ivan Melnikov

LD0807035390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1624 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Report on remarks by Ivan Ivanovich Melnikov, secretary of the party committee of the M.V. Lomonosov Moscow Order of the Red Banner of Labor State University at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow; from the program "At the 28th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] Comrade Melnikov emphasized that as discussion in the section developed, it became more and more clear that the section is making it possible to expose the basic issues which will become the focus of attention with the adoption of the congress' basic documents. The possibilities of an approach to these issues were also clarified. He said further:

[Begin Milnikov recording] The acuteness of the discussion has once more demonstrated that the problem of the renewal of the Party is the central aspect of the political problems being discussed at the congress, and, moreover, in the whole Party and in the entire society.

The assessments and proposals, which were on various levels and sometimes contradictory, had a common denominator—a committed aspiration towards strengthening the CPSU through its radical renewal. Support for the course of perestroyka and a line of developing democracy and glasnost and the maintenance of the unity of the Party were heard in the speeches. Taking into account that specific proposals on the draft rules, the program declaration and other documents have been handed over to the appropriate commissions set up by the congress, we consider it expedient to concentrate your attention on those issues in which, in the course of the discussion, most interest was expressed.

First, realization of the thesis on the power of the Party masses. Many proposals concerned the issue of increasing the role of congresses, conferences, and meetings as governing bodies. In particular, the opinion was expressed that they alone are governing bodies: they alone are authorized to adopt decisions of an obligatory nature. In this regard it was proposed that congresses and conferences be granted the status of permanently functioning bodies.

The following question was also asked: But can the Central Committee, the oblast committee, town committee, rayon committee, and party committee adopt decisions obligatory for the relevant party organization? The congress should define its position here.

The primary party organization, independently arranging its activity, adopts definitive decisions within the framework of the program and rules. The delegates consider that this is the point of departure in the realization of the power of the Party masses.

A great number of proposals concerning the mechanism of adopting decisions in the Party. It was emphasized that it is necessary, in the shortest possible time, to work out a position on the carrying out of party referenda at various levels. It is necessary to create conditions for the expression and consideration of various points of view, inter alia, on the basis of the platforms being put forward.

There were proposals on the possibility of the existence, under certain circumstances, of factions, as well.

Second, the organisational structure of the Party. Here the issue of the continuity of democratic centralism turned out to be at the center of discussion. I think than no one denied the necessity of the fulfilment of decisions adopted, election of party organs from below to the top, and the subordination of the minority to the majority. But, at the same time, the importance of strengthening the rights of the minority in the rules, the possibility of criticism of decisions adopted, democratization of elections, and the execution of predominantly direct elections to party okrugs was emphasized.

Certain comrades proposed introducing democratic unity instead of the term of democratic centralism. Those who spoke noted that it was impossible to leave the term "democratic centralism" in the rules without deciphering its content as the organic combination of democracy and discipline, autonomy, and centralism.

Raising the role and independence of the communist parties of the Union republics has raised the question of the relationship between them and of that sort of party the CPSU as a whole should be. By and large, two points of view have emerged here. One is that the present structure is sensible—opf course, with a further extension of the independence of the communist parties of the Union republics. The other point of view is that the CPSU is turning into a union of the communist parties of the Union republics.

As far as the territorial-production principle of the Party's structure is concerned, most people advocated its retention. At the same time, a number of speakers remarked on the need to attach greater significance to the territorial principle and to transfer the center of gravity still further into work according to domicile. The congress must make up its mind on these matters of the organizational structure of the CPSU.

Comrade delegates, for all the interest in specific questions, we would like to draw your attention to the content of the discussion on the fundamental theoretical problems that emerged in the section. Above all, this concerns the Party's social basis. The Party must make up its mind whose interests it intends to voice. Speakers cast doubt on the correctness of the thesis regarding the pan-national nature of the CPSU, and stressed that the Party must state clearly that first and foremost it defends the interests of the working class, the peasantry, and working people.

I cannot pass over those speeches which proposed renouncing the name "communist" for the Party, and which contained a call for the concept of the communist perspective and the communist ideals to be removed from its programmatic documents. This met with no great support. The thought came through powerfully in the speeches that renewal of the CPSU is inconceivable without the emergence in it of a new moral atmosphere. The party is an alliance of equals—equal not just in terms of their rights, but also in their common obligations to serve the Motherland. In the renewed Party, it is not reverence for rank or the expectation of instructions that will be most important, but democratism and trust, personal initiative, and the real participation of each and every communist in drafting and practicing Party policy.

We are as yet a long way from this ideal. Internal tension within the Party is still great, as is the accumulation of distrust which could be sensed in some speeches. The road to the renewed party is, above all, the road to genuine Party comradeship. Thank you for your attention. [end recording]

Secretary Ivan Frolov

LD0807142190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1629 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Remarks by CPSU Central Committee Secretary Ivan Frolov at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow; introductory paragraph by unidentified correspondent—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] CPSU Central Committee Secretary Frolov reported on the debate held in the section for ideological work in the party. He emphasized that a broad spectrum of views, some of them diametrically opposed, were put forward during the discussion. There was also self-criticism, a self-critical assessment of the level of theoretical and propaganda activities on the ground. It was also stated, however, that during the perestroyka years the most important thing has happened—there has been a genuine revolution in people's minds and an ideology of renewal, a concept and theory of perestroyka have begun to take shape. At the same time, however:

[Frolov] Many ideological workers and party committee heads believe that a lag has developed in the analysis of theoretical problems of social development. Those speakers believe that strategic issues such as the concept of humane democratic socialism and its connection with the communist future, the place and role of the party in a society undergoing renewal, the package of problems connected with the transition to a market economy and the reorganization of our federation with due consideration for genuine humanization of the entire system of social relations have not yet been properly worked out.

Some speakers, comrades, believe that there is no theory of perestroyka at all, with the result that our ideals are given no stable support in the mass consciousness. The delegates noted the lack of clarity in assessments, including those of various ideological trends and platforms, and the indistinct theoretical substantiation of a number of provisions and projects in the Central Committee's program statement. The delegates' speeches also pointed to the fact that there is a frequent lack of understanding of important theoretical conclusions due to insufficient explanation of them in the press and in the party propaganda system. For instance, it was noted that without a clear understanding of the essence of what one might call fundamental terms—socialism, the market, social democracy—it is now difficult to conduct practical ideological work.

Science and education formed an important subject of discussion in the section. The attention of the congress is, I think, deserved by the proposal that the CPSU should come out with a legislative initiative for the drawing up and passing of a law on science, and should also set up a special bursary fund for young scientists who show promise, particular in the social sciences field. It was stressed that unless we prevent the brain drain out of our country it could become a tragedy for our culture and the country's future.

Many delegates spoke about work with young people and the difficult circumstances teachers find themselves in. They proposed including in the congress' program statement a thesis on the priority status of education and schools for the immediate period of action. Work with young people must become a major commitment for CPSU members—this was stressed by many of the speakers.

The issue of the role of social sciences in today's conditions was poignantly raised in the section. Social sciences are gradually ridding themselves of external diktat; this is a normal process but it cannot produce instantaneous results. It takes decades to revive something that can be destroyed in a couple of years in the realm of the spirit. Purposeful, dogged, and thoroughly thought-out work is therefore needed, since objective knowledge of society and unbiased conclusions by academics—however bitter they may be—are vitally essential to the party. It was stressed in the section that the entire system of political education of communists, too, must be directed toward this too.

There is a need for the appropriate training of party cadres, which requires a thorough restructuring of the party's research and educational institutions. This was the conclusion of the debate within the section.

Delegates sharply posed the question of the need to defend Lenin and Leninism against attacks and in general of our attitude toward his ideological legacy. Speakers expressed the view that the image of Lenin needs to be freed of stereotype notions formulated by dogmatic ideology. The delegates emphasized that it is impossible and unnatural to depoliticize and deideologize the Armed Forces and the bodies of state administration.

A special theme is the grave state of our culture. It is necessary in the view of many delegates to place a firm barrier in the way of a purely commercial approach to culture and education.

Comrades, in conclusion I want to stress that in the general view the work of the section should help revitalize the ideological activity of the CPSU. The main thing is to overcome the individual's alienation from labor, culture, and power, and to direct the energy of a great people, which has been freed by perestroyka from authoritarian and bureaucratic fetters, toward creativity and tackling pressing and urgent problems. One needs to reflect on this and act in this way. Together we shall all create a new spiritual atmosphere in our much-suffering fatherland where the priorities will be the reason and humanity of the individual, from which we are unfortunately so distant. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Ukrainian First Secretary Gurenko

LD0807151190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1635 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Remarks by Stanislav Gurenko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, at 7 July session of 28th CPSU Congress; introduction by unidentified correspondent—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Gurenko, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, took the floor on behalf of the section on the party's social and economic policy. He noted that the section had given adherents of various programs, views and trends in the development of the economy and the social sphere and of the various platforms of the CPSU a chance to speak. The range of views is contradictory. Assessments are sometimes diametrically opposed. Nonetheless, one conclusion is indisputable, that the discussion reflected all the depths of society's concern and alarm at the urgency of the problems that are worrying millions of people.

[Gurenko] Affirming their commitment to the socialist choice, the speakers stressed that the aim of the party's activities remains that of service to the interests of the working people and the whole people and of creating living conditions worthy of a human being. It was indicated that the focus of the party's attention should be the working out and vigorous implementation of strong social and economic policy aimed at the dynamic renewal of society and its productive forces and at ensuring real transformations in our life. Here, for instance, is how Comrade Salskin, a delegate to the congress, formulated his thoughts: Any party that fails to offer a social and economic policy which the people can understand is doomed. There is no such policy today which the ordinary worker can understand. Our congress is simply obliged to define this problem and to charge the Central Committee and scientists with working out such a policy and publishing it in PRAVDA within three months. This notion was expressed in almost all the speeches. [applause]

At the same time, the participants in the section demonstrated unanimity in something else, their sharp negative appraisal of the current state of affairs. The state of the economy was assessed as critical. Some speakers believed that we have not yet really appreciated just how dramatic events in this sphere actually are. Among the factors that evoked particular concern they named the rapid increase in the unmanageable nature of the national economy, the development of a lack of proportion, the breakdown in the relations that had developed between the industries and the regions and, of course, the fall in people's living standards caused by these and other problems.

At the same time the discussion did not amount just to stating the problems. There was a tense, difficult and truly collective search for ways of getting out of the crisis. It did not always result in a consensus but it did permit positions and views to be more clearly defined and compared. In answer to the question as to what is to be done, those taking part in the section spoke not in favor of a return to a better model of administrative and command socialism, but of a move ahead and the majority see such a move in the transition to market relations. I stress, the majority but not all.

It was about precisely this problem that the greatest range of opinions was apparent from outright refusal and rejection to an uncritical, I would say, euphoric attitude. The majority I think were more struck by sober, considered points of view. It was noted inter alia that the development of a market mechanism cannot and should not be an aim in itself. The market is required as a means of overcoming an extravagant approach to economic tasks, based on expenditure, as a condition of expanding the independence of enterprises and establishing efficient links between producers and consumers, as an important factor in strengthening discipline and, finally, to increase the country's prestige on the international markets. For a market closed in on itself is not what is required by so great a country as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Apprehensions were voiced regarding the fact that forces, desirous of taking our society to capitalism by way of market economy, are operating ever more vigorously within the country. In this context, the participants in the section determined their attitude to the concept of a transition to a regulated market economy put forward by the government. I should be offending against the truth were I to say that this attitude was a positive one. Harsh, impartial, but demonstrative and, basically, constructive criticism prevailed. Of its many aspects, I should like to single out what follows. Firstly, the concept was criticized for being vague and woolly and for the fact that it is incomprehensible to the broad masses of the working people. In this connection, the following proposal voiced at the sitting and deserving of attention presents itself. A number of the speakers believe it is essential to instruct communists working in the government and the legislative bodies to work out in as short as possible a time a clear program to radicalize economic reform and the transition to market relations that would, and I stress, be comprehensible for all.

Secondly, people should be at the center of this program and this should also be understood by everyone. This means that the program should provide for a clear mechanism for people's social protection that can be unequivocally interpreted, for their protection from the possible negative consequences of economic reform and the transition to market relations. There was a proposal to introduce into the congress documents a clause to the effect that the CPSU will not support any measures to get the economy out of its crisis that would entail such consequences as mass unemployment and a fall in the living standard of broad sectors of the population.

Peasants' Union Chairman Starodubtsev

LD0907090690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1640 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Report on remarks by Delegate Starodubtsev, USSR Peasants' Union chairman, at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow; from the program "At the 28th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] [Announcer] Starodubtsev, a collective farm chairman who is chairman of the USSR Peasants Union, spoke on behalf of the section which has been discussing the CPSU's agrarian policy. He stressed that the roots of today's crisis situation in the countryside go back to the 1920s and 1930s. Agriculture has still not managed to recover from the distortions which were allowed to occur in the process of collectivization and the blanket nationalization of property which turned owners [khozyain] into hired laborers. An aging countryside, with backward equipment, poor scientific support, and a chronic shortage of resources cannot feed the country, the delegate noted. What is the solution?

[Begin Starodubtsev recording] In its decision, the March 1989 plenum proclaimed the right of the peasant to work freely on the land and to decide for himself on how to dispose of the results of his work. The equality of different forms of management was also recognized. The green light was given to leasing and other ways of making pay levels dependent on final results.

However, the reception given to these measures has been mixed in some areas and, more importantly, the implementation has been poor. Engrained patterns of thought and conservatism are to blame for this. But, as experience has shown, the main reason for this is the fact that the new measures are ineffective without the resources they need. The course proclaimed by the party and government of giving priority to the development of the countryside has not been backed up in practice.

On the contrary, the situation is actually getting worse. During the current five-year plan, agriculture has been supplied with fewer tractors, grain and fodder harvesting combines, mineral fertilizers, building materials, spare parts and other resources. Breakdowns in the supply of fuel have become more frequent. The situation as regards the development of storage and processing facilities is proving slow to change for the better. The program for the manufacture of machinery and equipment for food industries is not being carried out.

Inhabitants of the countryside, above all young people, continue to be attracted by the advantages of living in towns, brought about by an unequal division of the social product. The gap between the material supplies and amenities provided for inhabitants of towns, on the one hand, and villages, on the other, is still not closing.

During their discussions congress delegates spoke with concern about the increasingly unequal exchange between industry and agriculture, about the lack of thought given to decisions on agrarian questions of late. Delegate (Dubkon) spoke graphically about this. Mismanagement of the agrarian sector is leading to paradoxical and costly situations. Sometimes, for example, we try to auction off unprofitable collective farms, without seeking the views of those who run them. Or we play leaders and specialists, whose results are only modest, bonuses dozens of times bigger than their salaries.

Experience shows that the peasant must be securely protected against the brigandage of the market. In the process of switching to relations based on contracts, a number of industrial enterprises are arbitrarily raising the prices of their products. What is more, besides demanding payment in cash, they are also insisting that collective and state farms supply them with food and even manufactured goods which are in short supply. The countryside, which is short of everything, cannot stand up to such extortion.

It was unanimously agreed that social reconstruction of the countryside holds the key to solving the crisis. In order to save a number of zones, above all the nonchernozem soil zone of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the Aral zone and others, from total ruin, we have asked the congress, all communists and the entire Soviet people to devote the 13th five-year plan to the revival of the countryside. This is the key to solving the food problem in many regions.

As a result of the discussions with Comrade Gorbachev and Comrade Ryzhkov, the following general conclusions were drawn. The party must increase its influence among the peasantry. An agrarian policy which is understood and accepted by the countryside must be drawn up by methods which are characteristic of a democratic society.

The most important thing is not only to proclaim such a policy, but to ensure that it is implemented by the staff of the soviets and economic bodies, of work collectives, and by communists in rural areas. Over the next few years equality and competition between different forms of farming—publicly owned, leasehold, and private farms—must become a normal feature of life in the countryside. To this end the party should create an effective mechanism for using its influence with the recently created USSR Peasants Union. As its chairman, I know that, for its part, the Union will reciprocate in every way that is necessary.

Secondly, steps will be taken shortly to ensure parity in the development of the agro-industrial complex. I am talking about writing-off the debts of collective and state farms, the improvement of the price mechanism, the improvement in the supply of equipment, pesticides, spare parts, and building materials. A priority decision has been made to allocate an additional 7 million tonnes of petroleum products for harvesting work, by reducing exports.

In conclusion, I note that only the unification of constructive forces and the conscientientious work of all citizens without exception will extricate society from its moral crisis and material shortcomings. The peasants are opposed to all strikes, publicity-seeking demonstrations, and other improper methods for sorting out group interests. It is not because they are conservatives. No. People realize that several days or weeks of such so-called revolutionary actions would lead to damage that several years would be required to rectify. We also appeal to our colleagues the workers, miners, and other specialists for prudence. Appealing for discipline and order, Comrade Chernykh from Belgorod Oblast noted that for several years now we have been attempting to live without laws and holding heated debates which skirt extremes. He summed up this view as follows: The peasants ask all parties, platforms, and tendencies to reach a voluntary agreement and to prevent confrontation. We want to assure the congress that the peasants will give their active support to all constructive proposals. [Applause] [End recording]

Secretary Girenko

LD0807235190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1653 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Remarks by Andrey Nikolayevich Girenko, CPSU Central Committee secretary, at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow; from the program "At the 28th CPSU Congress" with introductory paragraph by unindentified correspondent—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Comrade Girenko, Central Committee secretary, spoke at the congress about the work of the section on CPSU nationalities policy. The delegates' speeches, he noted, have shown that the problem of interethnic relations is worrying everybody and influences the atmosphere in one way or another in labor collectives, educational establishments, and troop units and affects many families. Without avoiding the awkward points, as the delegate put it, he reported to the congress on the debates and the results of them.

[Girenko] If one sums up the sense of the speeches and separates out the particulars, one can single out these main trends in the debate that took place. First, a sharp polemic developed right away about formulation of the draft program statement on the priority of human rights over rights of nations. Delegate (Tiskov), director of the institute of ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences, called this standpoint a step forward compared with the previous party documents on the nationalities issue. Such an approach is in harmony with our aspirations to build a civil society and a law-governed state. On the other hand, writer Boris Oleynik and delegate from Armenia Comrade (Dolotyan) warned against absolution of this formulation, since, in their opinion, it bears with it the threat of eroding national community feeling, (?outside of which) concepts such as homeland, patriotism, and fatherland might be devalued. I think these objections and remarks should be heeded and it would be possible to propose something like the following formulation for consideration by the commission on the party's program statement: The CPSU, recognizing the inherent value of national forms of public life and defending the rights of nations, puts human rights in first place. Whatever the case, the priority of human rights, both in politics and in practical activities of party organizations, comes out today as extremely important, especially in light of the recent events in the Baltic republics and a number of other places.

Second, many delegates have expressed the idea in one form or another that the party must take steps to really express the national interests of all of our people and must overcome past excesses in nationalities policy, underpinning this with practical deeds. The party today has a new nationalities policy, but it is slow in being implemented. For people to have faith in our platform and program statement, concrete work is needed on resolving socioeconomic and national-cultural problems. We need a constant and undeviating stepping up of results, however modest, in the context of enhancing living standards and restoring respect for national language, culture, traditions, customs, and ceremonies. Joint work must be set up in this direction with soviets and all public organizations and movements.

In this context, anxiety was expressed that the well-known declaration adopted on the party's initiative on recognizing the repressive acts against peoples subjected to forcible resettlement as illegal and criminal and on ensuring their rights, which brought a very positive reaction among the people, later was essentially left hanging in the air because it was not backed by realistic measures to restore these peoples' rights. In particular, Delegate (Bagrov) sharply criticized the state commission on restoration of the rights of the Crimean Tatar people for failing to adopt specific decisions. Delegate (Vekov) expressed dissatisfaction with the work of the deputies' commission on the Ingush problem. Tardiness in resolving the problems of the Soviet Germans was also noted. The general mood on this question was expressed by Deputy (Zamakulov). He demanded that a political evaluation be made of the progress in implementing the declaration.

What seems to me to be justified amazement was expressed about the fact that the decision adopted as far back as at the 19th party conference and then by the USSR Supreme Soviet on creating a state committee on nationalities affairs has still not been implemented by the USSR Government. Meanwhile, it is precisely that body that would be able, once formed, to engage in the specific problems of one or another people, and in particular, the very acute problem of the refugees.

Third, the delegates were unanimous that growth in national awareness is an objective and positive factor. However, it is often parasitized by antisocialist and criminal forces. The desire was expressed for the party congress to appeal to the republics' communists and party organizations to wage an energetic offensive against nationalism and chauvinism in the name of the future of their peoples and in the name of the ideals of social justice, and for them to express the common opinion on the historically doomed nature and the futility for everyone of a separatist policy. I think we have the chance to do this by including the relevant formulations in the congress resolution on nationality issues.

Fourth, the debate showed that the problem of autonomy remains as before one of the most acute ones, resolved neither in the conceptual theoretical plane, nor in the plane of practical legislation. The legislative acts adopted on this score have not been to the satisfaction of the public, since the multilevel system of national-state and national-territorial formations is perceived as an injustice. Thus, the speakers noted that situation has worsened particularly in connection with the adoption at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies of its well-known declaration on sovereignty.

In particular, (Shamiyev), chairman of the Tatar Republic Supreme Soviet reported that in September a number of autonomous republics could adopt their own declarations of sovereignty. Let me note that the delegates shared the point of view expressed by Usmanov, secretary of the Central Committee. This amounts to saying that the declaration made by the First RSFSR Congress of Peoples Deputies should be regarded with understanding but the concept of sovereignty, in the sense of implementing it in practice, should be treated extremely cautiously.

Taking this into account, it is recommended that the CPSU Central Committee and the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee look carefully into this question, work out appropriate proposals, and take their legislative initiative to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Fifth, the debate brought out the fact that particular concern is aroused today by the state of affairs in drafting and concluding a new Union treaty, and in general in the whole set of issues connected with the renewal of statehood within the Union. Delegates approached this problem from various quarters. The absolute majority was in agreement with the standpoint set forth in the draft program statement of the 28th congress. At the same time, delegates are worried by the tardiness of the central bodies and by the real danger of losing the initiative in this matter. The opinion was expressed that the USSR president ought to take upon himself immediately and energetically guidance of the negotiating process.

One could express the general tone of the debate thus: the party, at our 28th congress, must state clearly and unambiguously that the course of perestroyka and democratization is subject to doubt, but democratization is only viable and effective when there is to be harmony, order, and discipline in the country.

International Department Head Falin

LD0707223490 Moscow Television Service in Russia 1701 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Report on remarks by Valentin Falin, head of CPSU International Department, at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow; from the program "At the 28th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] [Unidentified announcer] The CPSU section on international activity. At the rostrum is Falin, head of a Central Committee section. One subject for an exchange of opinions, he said, were the key moments of our country's past, and the forecast for the future. Several themes were raised that lie at the meeting-point between the party's domestic and foreign policies. Questions were brought up connected with the concept of new political thinking. The main line of the discussion was concentrated on the relationship between domestic and foreign policy at the current stage.

[Begin Falin recording] The comrades who have spoken did not cast doubt on the party's general line in the foreign policy area, its policy towards cutting arms, its move from declarations about peace towards an effective search for real ways to save the peoples from the threat of war. It was recognized that the new foreign policy has helped to change the world situation for the better, and to lead mankind out of the cold war. During the discussion, several critical judgements were expressed about the tactics and implementation of the party's foreign policy line. Attention was drawn to the fact that the Western powers are still not showing the necessary readiness to break with force in their political methods. Different, and sometimes opposing, approaches were set out towards the solution of a number of tasks in the area of international relations. Evidently this was a reflection of some processes that are typical of the state of public opinion as a whole, and also of the still insufficient level of information among party members on foreign policy and first and foremost on the specifics of talks.

Delegates picked out the problem of disarmament from the basic directions of foreign policy reflected in the CPSU Central Committee report. The importance was pointed out of the concept of reasonable sufficiency becoming a reference point for all the parties to the agreement. It was stressed that in this area there must not be any unjustified unilateral concessions. Some of the military comrades asked whether the country's security is not now being weakened. In this connection, the declaration of Comrade Moiseyev, head of the USSR Armed Forces general staff, who is a delegate to this congress, had a weighty resonance. He pointed out that positions on the talks and the talks themselves, the positions on the talks are worked out and the talks themselves are held with the closest possible cooperation of diplomatic, political, and military experts, and scientific specialists. Unreciprocated concessions are not made by us; the general balance of forces is strictly adhered to in Soviet-American agreements on disarmament, Comrade Moiseyev stressed.

One of the discussion's main themes was the situation in central and East Europe, and how far the unfolding of events was followed by the leadership. Were the measures taken adequate to the challenge? These are the questions that were asked. The far fetched and artificial nature of attempts to link our perestroyka with the loss of their leading role by the communist parties in most of the East European countries was noted. Instances were cited showing that the CPSU Central Committee had an idea of the foul processes in these countries, and in as far the principle of noninterference in internal affairs and respect of the right of peoples to choose allowed, tried to influence the situation.

Suffice it to say that since 1986, 103 meetings took place between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and representatives and leaders of the East European countries, and 147 meetings between other leaders of the CPSU Central Committee and them.

However, one cannot fail to note, too, a number of omissions in the work. In particular, legal back-up for several aspects of our cooperation with these countries was not provided in good time, and this includes cooperation in the field of defense.

During the discussion of the German question, particular emphasis was laid on the need not to lose sight of the country's security interests, in the name of which the people had given up millions of lives, during the talks on the external aspects of a settlement. The comrades who spoke noted that they were conveying the concern of the population, the labor collectives, and the party organizations about certain trends in present-day international life. The party masses and the broad strata of the public come out in favor of the inviolability of the USSR's borders on west and east, and resolutely reject interference by anyone in our internal affairs and attempts not to take into account the Soviet Union's legitimate rights.

Reflecting feeling in favor of the democratization of party life, the discussion participants pointed out the need to bring out and take into account more fully the points of view of party organizations in the localities and of rank and file communists when both the CPSU's general views on foreign policy and the approaches to individual problems are being formed. Delegates spoke with comradely concern about the fate of supporters of socialist ideas who are being subjected to public discredit and persecution for their views in a number of countries today.

It was proposed that an assessment of events in East Europe should be reflected in the CPSU program statement and that a political assessment of former party leaders for the decision to put troops into Afghanistan should be made in a special resolution or included in other congress resolutions; it was proposed that a set of measures be worked out to raise the effectiveness of the participation of local organizations and enterprises in foreign economic activity; that the restructuring of the work of the Central Committee apparatus, including the international department, be continued; and that the party and scientific aktiv be involved more broadly in the preparation and implementation of foreign policy measures.

The length of the present report does not make it possible to name all ideas and proposals of substance which were expressed at the section. They must be studied carefully and taken into consideration during subsequent work. [end recording]

Ryzhkov Answers Questions

LD0807132490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1707 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Remarks and answers to question by USSR Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congreses in Moscow; from the program "At the 28th CPSU Congress"—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrades, after my report I received about 600 questions, and the questions are still continuing to arrive. Therefore I was faced by the problem of what I should do when I mounted this rostrum and had 20 minutes to answer these questions. I realized that this would be an unrealistic undertaking and that in practice it would be impossible to answer all the questions. To answer only some of the questions would mean to ignore the others. Therefore I have striven over the past few days to provide written answers to the majority of questions, and the answers to the questions were distributed to comrades yesterday, although I am aware that not all the questions are answered there. If you notice, it is stated at the end that about 200 notes will be forwarded to the appropriate organizations for a solution to various private matters. They relate to matters regarding material and technical provisions and matters of a specific character concerning, for instance, the economic situation of various enterprises. I want, therefore, now to just dwell on certain fundamental issues that have not been included in this "collection," if one may call it such. Obviously, if time remains, there will be an opportunity, comrades, to ask me further questions.

I should like to begin from the fact that many delegates—the notes reflect this—appraised my report as a report of the government. Some said that it was in effect a supplement to the socio-economic section of the report by our party's general secretary. What can I say in this connection? I did indeed think for a very long time over how I would construct my report, especially after the decision was finally taken that members of the Politburo would not make speeches, as had earlier been envisaged, but would speak for 20 minutes to account for their activities. As a communist, of course, I had very many matters on which I should also like to have expressed my ideas. These related indeed to the life of our state as a whole, not just in the field of economics, but in politics, too. They related to interethnic relations. I did, of course, also have very big problems, questions, and anxieties in respect of our internal party life.

However, I felt it was necessary, all the same, to put the main emphasis in my report on the social and economic field of life in our country, since both according to the distribution of functions and as chairman of the Council of Ministers, I am in charge of this aspect. It would not therefore be quite proper to evade this issue to dwell on other, not less important, of our country's problems. And to be honest, the February plenum of the party Central Committee also taught me something when I spoke on purely internal party affairs, on party affairs, and was immediately greeted with the comment: Why is Comrade Ryzhkov not saying anything about the economy and just talking about the party? At the time I did actually believe it was my duty to voice my alarm at the situation that was devloping within the party. Things, you will recall, was leading to the repeal of Article 6, and of course we had to determine how the party was to live in the future in these new conditions.

I also want to answer the numerous questions that have not been compiled here. How do I personally take part in the Politburo as a member, not as the chairman of the Council of Ministers but as a member of the Politburo? I was elected a member of the Politburo in April, that same April of 1985. I had been appointed chairman of the Council of Ministers at the end of September the same year. As a result, I have taken a very active part in the work of our party's Politburo in the years since then. It is evidently for you to give an assessment of my activities within the Politburo. It is not for me to do this, but I can say that I have taken a very active part in the work of the Politburo. I have never just sat there and kept quiet. I have never been evasive or used cunning, but have expressed the ideas I believed were necessary. For the first three years of work in the Politburo, when the Politburo was still engaged in all economic matters—and it really was like that for three years in succession—of course the Council of Ministers submitted a great many proposals on the social and economic development of the country and, naturally, as the chairman of the Council of Ministers, i took a very active part in the discussion of them.

Questions have arisen here and have been put to me as to why I rendered an account on behalf of the government. Evidently, that was a mistake on my part. However, I want you to have a firm opinion, and when I spoke about the government and shortcomings in the work of the government, the mistakes made by the government—I think the government has done a great deal, not merely made mistakes; it has done much that is useful too—nowhere did I detach myself from the government as the chairman of the government. For this reason, wherever the word "government" has been written or spoken, you may regard me as being there. As the head of the government, I am fully responsible for the work of the government. Nor do I set myself the task of dissociating myself: that this is myself as the chairman of the government, and that is the government. There should be complete clarity about this.

Primarily, for my part, it was questions in the Politburo on social and economic development which were discussed. These were very varied. At the same time, the Politburo was not always comfortable for me as chairman of the Council of Ministers since, you see, each question was very seriously discussed. I have to say, comrades, that today a great deal of criticism is aimed at the Politburo regarding the style and methods of its work and its mistakes. As a member of the Central Committee, I seized, had, the opportunity to take part for a while in the work of the Politburo under Comrade Brezhnev. At the time I was working as the first deputy chairman of the State Planning Committee and my deputies dictated that on occasions I should visit the Politburo. I can tell you that it was quite a different atmosphere. If, in the past, a Politburo meeting lasted for 15 or 20 minutes, a question was read out "yes" or "no" was said, and the discussion ended there, so to speak; the Politburo meetings in recent years started at 1100 and ended at 2000 or 2100, sometimes even at 2200. I believe this is correct, that it is correct when all the members of the Politburo have the chance to voice their position. This atmosphere that has become part of the life of our Politburo and I believe—comrades, don't make such a noise—I think, God forbid that we should go back to what is used to be like. The atmosphere that has now been created does provide an opportunity for exchanging opinions and expressing one's own position. Of course it was difficult because at that time the Central Committee of the party included the industry departments, and these in effect duplicated the government. As a result, every question discussed in the Politburo was, whether we liked it or not, shadowed, as they say, in the party Central Committee and corresponding, sometimes very sharp, conversations took place there.

Comrades, a great many notes have been received on economic reform, about 50 percent of them, I would say. I do not think it now necessary for me to dwell once again on the fundamental provisions of switching to a regulated market economy, i.e. on the continuation of our economic reform. Enough has been said about that. There has been a great deal of criticism. Evidently, following the congress, all the propositions put forward here must be given careful and repeated consideration and all that is constructive weighted up again in order to discuss all these matters and submit them to the Supreme Soviet by September, by the time we have to draft a government program on this issue.

I should just like to dwell on on issue, so that nothing will be omitted here. Many comrades ask what my own attitude is to the words contained in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's political report saying that to begin the transition to a market economy with price rises is "absurd." I have talked to Mikhail Sergeyevich about this and I think that there is, evidently, a certain inaccuracy here that has resulted in there being so many conversations of this kind. I also believe that to begin the transition to the market only by increasing prices, and I stress "only," is absurd. A market economy, and indeed our further development, should not be seen like this. For this reason, once the word "only" is added, it corresponds perfectly to the intention. So, the whole of our transition to the market is an integrated program. We must not just stop with prices. I think that there is complete understanding of this and, of course, there cannot be a (word indistinct) transition only by increasing prices. We do, of course, understand that there are an awful lot of proposals on prices. This is the most acute matter, and we cannot get away from that.

[Presenter] Comrade Ryzhkov then answered questions from the microphones in the hall.

[Unidentified delegate) Esteemed Nikolay Ivanovich, the housing- 2000 program is the fundamental of all fundamentals. I should like to hear how the government, yourself included, are taking measures on your part to implement it, and particularly in a period when the Armed Forces are coming back today from the CEMA countries. And a second question: What measures are being taken by the government to get our country's harvest in and to provide fuel? We can see that machinery is standing idle and that we are losing grain before it is cut.

[Ryzhkov] I will answer the second question first. The government adopted a decision 10 days ago that in order to provide fuel for agriculture, we are obliged to withdraw 7 million tonnes of oil from exports, including oil to the socialist countries, and to send the oil to be refined at home in order to obtain diesel fuel and gasoline. We believe that the decision adopted will enable us to provide for the needs of agriculture. [applause]

The first question you asked concerning the Housing-2000 program. I believe that this program [disturbance in the hall] calm down now, comrades. I believe that we must not discard this program. First, we are amending this program because the initial data recorded in 1986 proved incorrect, and we must make certain amendments, taking into account the demographic changes that are taking place in our country. That is the first thing. Second, in order to guarantee this program, we need not the 550,000 of 600,000 [figures as heard] square meters of housing that we planned to build in the present 5-year plan, but to build a minimum of 900 million square meters of housing in the next 5-year plan. Is this possible? Yes, if we develop the construction industry appropriately. We think first of all that we have made advances in housing. Mikhail Sergeyeich said in his report that we will build 100 million square meters more housing in this 5-year plan than in the last. Second, there has been a dramatic turnabout in individual housing. We have increased individual housing construction by 40 percent. But there are a great many problems with building materials. These must be solved, both at the center and at local level.

Medvedev Answers Questions

LD0707234590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1721 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Speech and questions and answers by Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress in the Kremlin's Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade delegates! My position is also quite difficult, as 550 questions have come in. I replied to some of the questions yesterday, it is true, in the course of the ideological section's work, but of course such a sea of questions cannot be embraced, the more so as they touch on literally everything, just as ideology reflects all of the processes occurring in our society, and of course, ideology also has its own problems. So, I have tried to group the questions that have been submitted. I shall refer to some of them, and I shall reply to the most fundamental formulations contained in the notes. I would like first of all to comment on the questions, or rather, notes which contain an assessment of ideological work and of my work personally, and which are actually not questions but an expression of opinion. Comrade (?Galkin), Moscow Oblast, writes: How is it that with your arrival in the Politburo, all ideology in the party has been totally destroyed? [feeble applause] Your involvement in the CPSU's disintegration, and what personal responsibility are you prepared to bear for the political crisis that has emerged?—(?Gladyshev). Vadim Andreyevich, we ask you to tell us specifically, why is it that ideological work in the party has sharply deteriorated? Answer this question—what has made it possible to demolish ideological work in the party to such a extent? Well, as you can see, there is in these questions no sign of any doubts, reflections, or lack of clarity: They simply set out a point of view. Ideology is finished, and that is the end of the matter, they say. But no new ideology, an ideology of perestroyka, this kind of note asserts, has been created. Of course, all of this is scathing, and quite painful, but let us think and sort it out: Are we not falling, with such an assessment—and I have in mind an assessment not of my personal work, but an assessment of ideology—into a certain false position? It might be asked: What kind of ideology is this, if it could be demolished in a short time by one man? [feeble applause]

What ideology is it that has been demolished if a new one has not been created? If it is the old ideology, the ideology of Stalinism and stagnation, then perhaps that is not all that bad. One must get to the bottom of this. What does one get? That in former times when hypocrisy and falsehood reigned in ideology, stagnant thoughts, dogmatism, and narrowness of thought, there was a huge divergence between word and deed, a shameless restriction of glasnost. Ideology flourished. Now when we are freeing ourselves of all this and have entered the path of renewal, ideology has collapsed.

Have assessments not been mixed here, comrades? Does homesickness for past times not show through in them? Are not the death-pangs of the past mixed with the birth-pangs of the new? Of course, with this I do not want to say, and I do not in any way want to embellish the situation in ideology. It remains unhealthy, difficult, in a crisis. The process of derusting has affected also the healthy layers of our so-called organism. A wave of this fault-finding, the striving to overturn the foundations of socialist ideolgoy,has arisen.

I do not want to justify the sluggishness of the ideological centers, including my own work, too. All this needs to be thoroughly—and I will go into that—thought over. The essence of the questions boils down to this: If perestroyka is the collapse of ideology, just as perestroyka is the collapse of the economy, then it must be stopped short and reversed. If, however, this is a painful process of reconsidering our positions, if it is a painful and difficult process of restructuring our society, then this process must be assisted and look not backwards but forwards.

Comrades, very many questions have come in on theoretical problems. I do not think that now is the time and place to dwell on them. I could quote a few of them: Here is, so to speak, both the humane democratic socialism and the absence of a concept of a socialist society, and my personal contribution to the theoretical elaboration of these questions. I would like to say only one thing: Is there or is there not an ideology and concept of perestroyka? The negation of the fact that such an ideology exists has become a distinctive stereotype in public consciousness. You know, I will refer to an exchange of rejoinders with the esteemed Academician (Toktelidze) who is in the Presidium. He told me in the interval: I do not understand how it can be said that there is no ideology or perestroyka. What is perestroyka itself? It is, after all, an ideology above all. Not only an ideology, but above all an ideology. You see, it is a decisive break with old notions and dogmas, with the old thinking and with the old psychology. How can it be said that an ideology of perestroyka is nonexistent? Of course, not all questions have been answered. Nor is there a general picture. All this must be admitted. But I would like to say in this connection that it is naive to imagine that such a complete picture, a complete draft of restructuring matters, would be created, and after that we must start implementing it. After all, in building one must work in accordance with a blueprint, let alone in such a complicated matter as social transformations.

And one other thing. We who have, so to speak, been brought up the whole time in the old traditions have grown accustomed to think that some oracle, some messiah will make an appearance, say everything and put everything in its place, and that all that will be left for us to do will be to comment on it and implement it. Or to set some institute, some group of academics, sit them down for months and they will create for us an ideology, a theory of socialism and a theory of perestroyka. This is a naive idea. It stems from ideas of ours which we cultivated with regard to Marx and Lenin, but they were not people working on their own; they reflected the revolutionary process of their day. I believe, therefore, that, in no way removing the responsibility from the ideologists, from the theoreticians and the ideological front, I believe that the ideology and theory of perestroyka and our ideas of a humane and democratic socialism and our society's future can only be forged in the crucible of our practical activity, revolutionary transforming activity, and can only be the fruit of collective efforts.

As far as my own personal contribution is concerned, I could say that I had a direct and immediate participation in working out all theoretical and practical, all theoretical and political documents in recent times. Besides this, there have been personal publications of mine. I can recall articles in KOMMUNIST, including an article on the cognition of socialism [k poznaniyu sotsializma]—an article of principle which appeared at the end of 1988. There have been articles in PRAVDA, including articles on the problems of ownership which represent the center of the whole economic reform. Many methodological problems have been set down in the textbook on political economy which appeared before I went over to ideological work, or at approximately the same time. There have been dozens of speeches to the widest variety of audiences which in some measure or other have been published in the press and have become available to the public.

Is this a lot or a little? No doubt it's not very much, but you know it is not my custom to sign theoretical articles that have been written by other hands, and I can explain a great deal by this.

More than 100 questions have come in about the mass information media. The emotional content of the overwhelming majority of these notes, questions, and assertions amounts to the feeling that we should suppress, although there are accusations the other way round, of my suppressing MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, OGONEK, the Seven Days television programs, and so on. I myself catch it quite a lot in the press, and no one can suspect me of any desire to protect it from criticism. But I am convinced, and I remain of this view, that no one will ever win from building his relations with the press upon fierce confrontation, but not on ideology. [sentence as heard]

I would like to deflect the accusations about the party press. Incidentally, there were questions asked about the dynamics of the party press. I can say in more concrete terms that for PRAVDA, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, and KOMMUNIST, the fall in subscriptions has been checked this year. For RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, SELSKAYA ZHIZN, and EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN, one sees growth in the party press. We work regularly with the party press. We meet every week, and sometimes more frequently, to discuss all current points, and I cannot accept accusations against the party press that it is becoming yellow, as is stated in one of the notes.

As far as some of our press organs are concerned that have been named here—MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, OGONEK, ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, and so on, well, my attitude toward them is critical, particularly toward those articles in which unbridled propaganda against our party, party workers, and so on is being carried out. We organize a rebuff. There have been a number of articles both PRAVDA and in KOMMUNIST.

But I must say outright that this is such a barrage of criticism that it is getting harder and harder to keep it back. I can point to very successful speeches, both in the press and on television, entering into discussion with our adversaries and opponents. However, I don't think that's the point. Of course, the point here is that, and the comrades have spoken about this here, the work conditions of our press are changing fundamentally, and the leadership methods must also be different. They must have their basis in the law and in strict observance of our legislation, and of course they should be backed up by the party and civic conscience of the journalist and the leaders of the mass media.

There is a certain problem here, but I should like to say that it is of an all-party nature, and our congress gives us graphic proof of this. Various points of view are put forward, up to and including those that the majority of us reject. The leaders of the mass media reason this way: If there are speeches of this kind at the People's Deputies Congress and at party forums, why do they not have the right to appear on the pages of the press? We say to them: But give your own party point of view. They do not always do so, comrades. The problem here lies in determining a party pluralism of views, and this it seems to me is one of the congress' tasks. We must expand our ideological and political platform, but with clearly defined ideological and political boundaries, and then act in accordance with these in the future.

Unfortunately, there are few questions about culture, and most of them refer to the outburst of sex and pornography. This can, evidently, be explained but, evidently too, it speaks of the fact that the problems of culture still need to be more profoundly assimilated.

Nor do I get away without curiosity items. I have also been asked: How do you assess the sexual revolution in the USSR and your own contribution to it? [laughter] You see, one must even render account for that, but on this I have nothing to report! [laughter and applause]

Comrades, most profound changes are taking place in the sphere of culture, contradictory and positive changes and negative phenomena. I agree with the categorical formulation of the impermissibility of lack of taste, vulgarity, unruliness, and cruelty. Pluralism and attacks on common human values are far from one and the same thing. My own position on this issue has been advanced on many occasions. It has been reflected in the document of the ideology commission published in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, on the main issues of party policies. We must all get down to business on this, and I think that here too we must above all be supported by the force of law. But here is how we are supported by the force of law. Official information from the USSR Procuracy: A few years ago, 300-400 people were given criminal sentences for producing and selling pornographic artifacts and publications disseminating a cult of violence and cruelty, mostly individuals engaged in showing foreign-made video films. In 1989, 52 people were given criminal sentences under these Criminal Code articles, and in other union republics. We are lowering our exactingness ourselves and not making use of the force of law, although I do believe that the legislative mechanism requires additions. The ideological commission has developed and submitted proposals to that effect.

A couple of words, comrades, on interethnic relations and the Baltic. There were questions: Why did you not say anything about interethnic relations, as though this is not ideological work? I indeed did not mention this. I took part in the platform's elaboration, and at the ideological commission there was discussion of the ideological aspects of interethnic relations. Concerning the Baltic, I can say that, of course, we probably have to analyze everything here more deeply. There were mistakes, but concerning my trips to the Baltic, I can assure you that my conscience is clear, 100 percent. Never, not in a single one of my speeches, either printed or verbally delivered, did I evade vexed issues. I assessed nationalist and separatist feelings as was warranted by the situation, and I set out the party point of view on these matters.

In conclusion, comrades, certain personal factors. This is a question that was submitted to me: How do you objectively assess your predecessors' ideological work in the Politburo, Comrade Ligachev and Yakovlev? What do you think; have you personally done everything to sharply improve ideological work? Well, I shall refrain from assessing my colleagues, the more so as these are matters of the past. I would like to say that the ideological ship, when I arrived in the autumn of 1988, was being rocked strongly, it was being rocked to left and right, and moreover, unlike an ordinary ship, to left and right at the same time. The task was set: to smooth out the movement of the ideological ship, direct it into a constructive channel, and to invigorate ideological work. I aspired to do everything in this direction. I am sure, and I can tell you now, that the course in ideology, the course of perestroyka, was correct and remains correct. It is another matter that ... [changes thought] I therefore reject all accusations that I was conducting some other game, was demolishing something, and so on—sincerely and correctly to the adjusted course of perestroyka, in accordance with the party's political course as a whole.

[sentence as heard] There were, of course, shortcomings and errors. I think the main point is that, in destroying and dismantling the old, we did not create new ideological mechanisms with the same energy, persistence, and scrupulousness; there was insufficient vigor, militancy, and drive. The link with the masses and the localities is weak, although I must say that we gathered the secretaries of oblast party committees three times, as distinct from previous years when they met very rarely. Twice we gathered the heads of propaganda departments, carried out training and so on, but this is insufficient; we did not get as far as the rayon party committees, or to the primary party organizations, and we did little to help the primary party organizations to restructure themselves in their work.

Comrades, I am winding up. I would like to answer one more question in conclusion. Vadim Andreyevich, have you ever thought of resigning during the period you are reporting on, and if you have, what stopped you?

I must say that this thought has not only occurred to me, but it has been in my mind all the time. You know that, all the more so, since from time to time I have been reminded about this. Under the harshest pressure of events and criticism from right and left, it is not so easy to endure all this work. But I was restrained by a sense of responsibility for the matter entrusted to me, for what is happening, and for the stability of the country's political leadership. I believed that I could be useful in this situation and spread opinions, so to speak, well, with some kind of common sense, some kind of realistic approach to the processes taking place.

I never strove for a ruling position. I have found many attributes of this ruling position onerous. Comrades can confirm this. Well, I have tried to work honestly, putting all my efforts into the cause of socialist renewal. And I feel no pangs of conscience in this respect, I tell you honestly, comrades. I am not holding on to a ruling post now, and, indeed, when the congress is opening a new page in our development, a very complex and very difficult one, I am not leaving my job, but consider that indeed younger and more energetic, and, perhaps, more assertive people, should enter. There are already such people and they have appeared, among others, in the ideological sector, and in the ideological department of the party Central Committee.

Now, it is necessary to discard everything that is superfluous. I believe as I have always believed, that fate must be in my favor. For my part, I must be grateful to fate that I have managed to take part in the process of our society's renewal. And I will continue to work in this area in the future and will never betray its goals and ideals. Now it seems to me that we must cast overboard everything superfluous, and take care that the congress will enter the new phase with a leadership devoted to the cause of democratic restructuring, so that the congress in no way diverges from the will and mood of the people. That would be disastrous for all of us. And I think that the congress will carry out this task, and I will participate in the resolution of these issues. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

[Announcer] Like Comrade Ryzhkov, he also answered questions asked directly in the hall.

[(Tsipilevich)] One of the basic functions of the country's political leadership is to forecast the unfolding of events in the country and in the party. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, speaking yesterday, warned us communists that we would soon be treated as they are in the countries of East Europe. Be so good as to make a forecast, or a guess, where this process will start first? In Moscow, in Leningrad, or in the Baltic? [mixed reaction in hall] (Tsipilevich), from the Estonian CPSU delegation.

[Medvedev] I think that our task here at the congress is not to make forecasts, but to do everything to ensure that the party is preserved,to preserve its positions, defend them actively, and of course we need to anlalyze (?the party), and this is being done—although I must admit that so far no serious forecasting work has been organized in the party Central Committee, only individual attempts in individual areas. This seems to me a very important task for the future leadership.

[(Lazusko)] Delegate Valentin Antonovich Lazusko, from the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. Esteemed Vadim Nadreyevich, you have visited our republic several times recently, and I must say you did a lot to prevent the schism in our Communist Party, and to achieve the consolidation of its forces. It is probably not your fault that this schism took place, and you have helped and are helping us greatly. On behalf of the Lithuanian Communists, allow me to express my great gratitude.

But this is my question. Long before 11 March, before the separatists came to power, all the mass media, including the party press organs, the material basis, the printing presses and so on, owned by the CPSU and the CPSU Central Committee, in essence passed into the hands of the oppositionist, antiparty forces. How did it happen that the CPSU Central Committee either did not see this, did not notice it (?from its great height), or was this done consciously, that the whole base was handed over to the opposition, to our direct opponents, and the party found itself without a single organ and completely lacking a material base—no television, no printing press, no media of this sort? This is what we cannot understand even today. Thank you.

[Medvedev] You mean the Lithuanian mass media?

[(Lazuskov)] Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes.

[Medvedev] The Lithuanian ones.

[(Lazuskov)] But I am afraid it is not just us.

[Medvedev] Yes. We did everything to help the Communist Party of Lithuania, first the single one, then the CPSU, to keep the mass media in its hands. But it did come to pass that indeed Sajudis strengthened its position in them step by step. And the publishing house: You know what happened with the publishing house. In spite of the Central Committee decision adopted on the publishing house, and of serious steps taken, it still remains in the hands of the Communist Party of Lithuania that has split off from the CPSU. And there is a legal side to the business. Take hold of it in practice, take hold of it, through your communists, have some influence, take it. [commotion in hall]

Central Committee Secretary Yakovlev

LD0707204890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1747 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Speech and questions and answers by Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin's Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] [Yakovlev] Esteemed comrade delegates: A total of 155 notes have been handed over from the Congress Secretariat and also to me personally. They contain more than 250 questions. In territorial terms, 80 percent are from the Ukraine and Belorussia. The overwhelming majority of the questions are expressed in a sharp form, to put it mildly. The remainder are put amicably.

First of all, for understandable reasons, I am not going to reply to those that express a more or less positive attitude toward my work. I will answer the questions where I am asked about my blame or guilt for this, that, and the other.

First on the Baltic issue. There are a lot of questions. Comrades from the Moscow Oblast, from Latvia, from Vilnius, and from Tallinn ask me to assess both the current moment and they also ask me what responsibility I bear for the split of the party, for the separatist movement, and so on and so forth in the same spirit.

This is a very old story. Quite honestly, until now I have been trying to sort out its aims and direction but I now have no other way out—and I offer the congress delegates my apologies—I have no way out other than to prove and to quote my own words. The whole thing amounts to this, you understand, that in the main all of these accusations—no, not in the main—they do not contain any direct indications whatsoever, any references whatsoever to words or speeches.

So this is what I said in Vilnius about nationalism: Evidently there is an acute need for a solid, law-based assessment of interethnic relations. Protection against one's own shortcomings, self-analysis, and self-knowledge are evidence of national wisdom. Does national self-awareness merely boil down to pride on the part of those who belong to one particular nationality or another? We should not embark upon the path of competing where pride is concerned, we should not make reason subordinate to irrational feelings. Where reason is switched on, responsibility, too, is switched on. What we are talking about is internationalism, not just as a political entity but as a moral entity, too. Nationalism begins where the interests of one's own people or nation are set up in opposition to the interests of others, when spiritual links between them are either restricted or broken off. Nationalism is not only blind, it is antihuman, it looks for enemies rather than friends, it confronts but does not unite.

Next, here is what I said in Riga. It is stupid to shy away from one's own history. This proves irrefutably that the fates of the Baltic and Slavic peoples have long been united. A Soviet person of whatever nationality should be able to feel at home everywhere. Any dividing line on grounds of nationality would be the burial ground of hopes and the grave of democracy. In relations between the nationalities, most dangerous of all are carelessness, haste, tactlessness, and attempts to whip events into ever more arrogant national pride. Dividing society into national, social, spiritual, or any other reservations means condemning both society and ourselves to stagnation, regress, and worse trials which nothing justifies and, ultimately, to move not forward but backwards and far backwards at that. That is what I said. [applause]

People ask me—but I will say that when I was there two years ago, when I made my speech, I spoke of the need for sovereignty too, the need to end the dictate of the departments, of really building a new federation, etc., etc. There was no talk of a split, of separation, etc. at that time at all, or at least no one spoke about it. No one spoke about it. For this reason, the conversation was held in quite another situation, and it is simply impossible to extrapolate that situation into the present since the development of events has taken an irrational course; something to which I am categorically opposed. What is needed now, the comrades ask? I believe that restraint and responsibility are now needed on all sides. The political dialogue and latest actions in Vilnius and Moscow are a step in the right direction. Above all, the advance of perestroyka and above all, a switch to the market and a new union treaty. I am resolutely opposed to any defamation of communists or hooligan (?attack) on monuments, the Army, and all such things. This cannot, of course, simply be put down to culture—who is doing these things—but rather to some kind of vandalist tendencies and the sentiments that have, sadly, emerged there in recent years. That covers that point of view.

I also have a separate question. Have you prepared any further action, it asks, a note to the Politburo, on the results of your trip to the Baltic? What is the content of that note? Have its conclusions affected further development? I did not write a note and no such note exists. Then more of the same.

Next, also in this category of question: I am accused of having persistently striven for the revocation of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. That is not true. I said in my report that the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact was legitimate and only history will judge its significance, so to speak.

for our country. It was also essential and in accordance with international law, only the war in 1941 repeals an international agreement of this kind. That is the first thing.

I insisted, and the commission agreed, and the congress agreed to consider as illegal—because to revoke is another matter—as illegal, the secret protocols to this pact. This is what is at issue. Therefore, there could not be any question of any pact, and no one placed this in doubt, the more so as it has existed since 1941. I am trying ... [Yakovlev changes thought] the comrades are asking about the appeal from the union deputies' group; I haven't seen it, but I have heard. Having published this in LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, they are proposing investigating my activity in the Baltic, throughout the Baltic at once. I agree with the proposal on the creation of a deputies' commission to investigate these activities in Lithuania, but with a request: If it turns out that I am guilty of anything, then I am ready to bear responsibility, but if the comrades are pursuing certain political goals in this, then excuse me, there also, clearly, has to be responsibility in equal measure. [applause]

There are many questions on East Europe. Comrades, I agree with the assessments made in this connection both in Mikhail Sergeyevich's report and in the speech, or report, by Comrade Shevardnadze. The causes are specific to each country and common to all states. If the people turn their backs on the party, this is a matter for the people, it means that the policies of those parties are not perceived by them as their own popular policies. And it was not only a matter of antisocialist forces, which, of course, are obvious and visible to all of us, but the main thing was people's attitudes and the attitudes of the mass of communists. The analysis is still to be made, but comrades, when they say or blame the Central Committee for the socialist system's collapse, at this very time we must remember what happened in Berlin in 1953, in Hungary in 1956, and in Czechoslovakia in 1968. I was in Czechoslovakia in 1968, restoring the foundations of socialism, so to speak, and to this day, I feel uncomfortable about that mission.

We must look into things deeply, however, comrades. Did we not have a break in relations with China, Albania, and Yugoslavia before perestroyka? One must not bury or hasten to bury socialism in East Europe. If substantial elements of socialism are now taking root in the West too, especially in the social sphere, they will make their mark in these countries as well. But you cannot get away from life. You cannot, by a Central Committee decision, annual the fact that industry has increased ten times faster in South Korea than in North Korea in recent years, or that living standards in West Germany are considerably higher than in East Germany. Can you and I here, even at the Congress, really resolve these issues? No, we cannot. [applause]

We must, of course, and one of the note writers is correct when he says that normalization in Europe has objectively reduced our role as a military guarantor and leader. I would say, comrades, that I agree with this, but this normalization of the situation in Europe has reduced not only our role, but also that of the United States, as military guarantors and leaders in Europe, and I think this is a good thing. As we have said more than once, each party bears responsibility first and foremost before its own people and its own country for the policies it pursues, and I think we ought to take, or it is time to take, seriously the words non interference in internal affairs.

We have given moral support to the politically fraternal parties and their communists, and continue to do so, and of course we cannot fail to be angered when they are pursued or there are witch hunts against them as happened in the United States during the McCarthy period. But at the same time, I think that reason will come to the fore, and recently we have been seeing that several Communist Parties are receiving significantly more votes at elections than they actually expected. I have recently had meetings with Comrade Gysi, Comrade Mohorita, Comrade Miller, and Comrade Lilov. Of course they are in difficult positions, but they are not in the least losing hope for the future, but saying that they really do need to restructure, to go to the masses and earn authority among the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia whom they have lost.

They are saying that we overturned the communist movement there. I fundamentally disagree with this. During this time we reestablished (?our internal,) our interparty relations, with a party like the Chinese one, and this means something for the international working movement. Many people from socialist countries have reached out to us. We now have normal relations with the Socialist International and other socialist parties in power in West Europe, and not only in West Europe. Our relations have improved with many Western communist parties, once we had cast off the blinders of our ideas about so-called Eurocommunism.

Next. That is everything about East Europe. Now comrades are writing about the destruction of CEMA and the Warsaw Pact. Well, in the section about the Pact, Comrade Moiseyev spoke quite convincingly. CEMA is restructuring itself, and is really restructuring itself. This does not come directly into my sphere of activity, but I know that CEMA must be restructured. It is now [Yakovlev changes thought] ... the fact that we are changing to direct relations and financial calculations in hard currency itself requires perestroyka. Evidently, some of the direct links have not justified themselves, while others are now coming up. I think that CEMA, as an economic organization, once it has restructured its work, does have a future. As for the Warsaw Pact, I see no basis for saying that it has collapsed, and the latest session of the ministers of defense indicates precisely that.

I must give you my impressions of the latest Political Consultative Committee session. It was a meeting of people who trust each other, and no one raised the question of its disintegration in the way that it is usually raised about the disintegration of the community, the disintegration of mutual aid, and so on, and economic links, and so on and so forth. I think all this will develop.

Next. That is all for the collapse of the community.

Yes. The collapse of the international workers' movement. In these circumstances, do you consider it necessary to set up an international organization like the Communist International?

I don't think that we would be able to do this even if we wanted to do so very much. The commission was abolished, was dissolved during the war, and the Cominform was dissolved some time during the 1950's and any attempts to unite in some way come up not against our differences with the communist parties concerned but against differences between the communist parties, differences in their standpoints and views on life.

Why have meetings been stopped between Comrade Gorbachev, the general secretary, and leaders of the communist parties during official visits to the capitalist countries?

I cannot remember an occasion when Mikhail Sergeyevich has not met the leader of a communist party, regardless of the country he has visited. This simply has not happened.

There are some questions about Germany.

Yes, this is a serious question. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze has spoken about this here. Indeed, it cannot fail to disturb Soviet people. But comrades, this is not some invention of perestroyka, nor is it an invention of the leadership that we now have. We have always put forward the question of Germany's unification. The first time, I think, was either at the end of 1945 or at the beginning of 1946; then I think it happened in 1952, and so on. And now it has been put forward by life itself, by life. The fact that we must now do everything possible in order to ensure that there is no threat to the Soviet Union from German territory and that we do not experience anything like the nightmare we have already once experienced—that is another question.

Do you believe—they write here—that the reckoning has now begun of the era of peace in the life of mankind?

Yes, I do believe that. That the construction of a civilization of a new type without wars and without weapons is already beginning? Yes, I believe that, too.

The common European home. They say that someone in the West is building it and that later, they will allow us in and give us the key for one of the apartments in it.

Comrades, the idea of the Common European Home was put forward by the Soviet Union, not by the West European countries. It made very difficult progress there under pressure from ourselves, including big pressure at that, and under pressure from progressive forces. So the question of who is going to allow whom into the common European home will still have to be looked at.

To continue. Have I used up all my time?

[Unidentified speaker] You still have three minutes left.

[Yakovlev] How many people, I am asked, perished during the repressions? We still don't know this, because in some instances, there are no lists. In the case of certain burial sites, we just don't know where these people came from or how they got there. It is simply impossible to find out what happened or to identify who these people are. We have now managed to reconstruct [vosstanovit] the cases of almost a million people, as I told you. Clearly, this process must continue. It is impossible to say precisely how many at the moment. But I am convinced that we must give this information and we will do so. [long pause] I am prepared to stay at the microphone. But if the comrades are not interested in the questions that I have ... [Chairman Niyazov, speaking at the same time, says "microphone No. 7" then "Comrades, No. 7". Considerable background commotion and shouting]

No, I have—I still want to answer two questions. [shouting continues] There are several questions about whom I see as a contender for the post of general secretary. My answer—Comrade Gorbachev, Mikhail Sergeyevich.

Now for a question about myself personally. Naturally, some of the people who have submitted questions are demanding my resignation. Others do the opposite, so to speak. I want everything to be in order here, to be okay. I have decided this question for myself. Therefore, I thank those who have supported me, but I will satisfy those who are demanding my resignation. Although nominations have not started, I ask you all—and here I'm answering those who have submitted these slips—not to bother when they do start. From this rostrum, I withdraw my name. Thank you. [brief applause, more commotion]

[Kalinin] There is another question.

[Niyazov] Microphone No. 3.

[Kalinin] I am delegate Kalinin from the city of Moscow. My registration number is 1431. Esteemed Aleksandr Nikolayevich, do you support Comrade Ryzhkov's proposal that the congress delegates should be allowed to make an assessment of himself and the Politburo?

[Yakovlev] Well, I will speak frankly. I don't really understand why we're making these report-backs or why I'm here on the rostrum. I'll tell you why. The Politburo is a collective body. It takes collective decisions and implements them in a collective way. We have tried to work out what each of us has done personally, but 90 percent of this work has taken place in collective conditions and in the context of collective decisions. That is why I now think that the best thing to do would be to assess the work of both the Central Committee and its executive body, the Politburo, which is the executive body between plenums. But now we will be trying to divide and to measure up which of us has done less or more, who has done better, and who is the purest. I don't think this is a totally moral approach.

[Kachanov] Kachanov, Mikhail Nikolayevich, a member of the Lithuanian [CPSU Platform] Communist Party Central Control and Auditing Commission. Aleksandr Nikolayevich, I have several questions for you. First: When reporting at the People's Deputies Congress on the 1939 Pact, you passed over in silence what the Smetona government did from 23 August to 28 September 1939. This is just 36 days. While Stalin and Molotov did indeed sign amoral pacts, what morality guided the Smetona government at that time, taking part in Vilnius while Poland was still fighting? What moral factors guided the Smetona government, when in 1940, it sent various messages to Hitler, when there was a split? Why did the commission keep this quiet, giving various extremist forces the opportunity of pursuing a line of debasing the socialist system? That's the first question.

Second, my letter to Politburo members, including to you, in autumn 1989 expressed the wish that the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party should not be allowed to go ahead. My letter said that this congress would lead to a split not only in the Lithuanian Communist Party, it would engender various separatist movements in our CPSU. I earnestly requested all Politburo members to investigate this carefully, using their collective wisdom. That was in the autumn 1989. It was only on 4 February 1990 that I was told by the department for relations among nationalities that my letter had been studied and all Politburo members were familiarized with it. You know about that letter. What is your reaction to it?

Third, I have sent you personally several theoretical articles about the problems of socialism in our society. You sent them to the journal KOMMUNIST, but not a single article saw the light of day. Are you prepared, tomorrow in a room somewhere here, to enter publicly into a debate on these matters with me? [Applause]

[Yakovlev] First, the mandate of the commission endorsed by the Supreme Soviet...[Yakovlev corrects himself] the People's Deputies Congress concerned only the Ribbentrop Pact, and not a study of the actions of government you are talking about. That's the first thing. Second, of course, we did not study all these matters in isolation from the policy conducted by previous governments, including the 1939 government. It is clear to me, and I feel that's the way you see it too, that they pursued an anti-Soviet policy, a pro-German policy. That's the first part. Second, I did not read your letter, I am prepared to read it anew, if I can go and read it. As for the third point, I am ready to enter into debate with you, by all means, at any time.

Ligachev Answers Questions

LD0807131690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1812 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Answers to questions by CPSU Central Committee Politburo member Yegor Ligachev at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow; from the program "At the 28th CPSU Congress"—recorded]

[Text] [Ligachev] Esteemed comrades, communist comrades, I have received through the congress secretariat 157 written questions. Naturally, like my Politburo comrades, I could do nothing else but form them into groups, since there was no other solution and no time to spare. Allow me to answer the questions.

One long note relates to agrarian policy and its implementation. Comrade Avdoshkin, a delegate from the Altay, states that on 27 June LITERATURNAYA GAZETA said that the country annually invests 100 billion rubles in agriculture. How much more is needed to rectify the situation in the countryside and fill the shop counters with food products? There are other notes too of roughly the same kind.

I want first of all to say to you that according to Goskomizdat [State Committee for Publishing Houses] figures, the average annual allocation to agriculture over the past five years...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] You mean Komstat [Committee for Statistics]

[Ligachev] Yes, according to Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] figures the allocation has been R51 billion. That is to say, the newspaper indicated an enormous figure, a figure double that. I think that, if we invested roughly that amount of money—this is not my own opinion but that of very authoritative research institutes and specialists—the food question in our country would naturally look somewhat different. But this is not the main thing. The main thing is parity in prices between town and countryside.

I want to say with all frankness so that you will correctly understand me that I am not in favor of giving funds to the countryside without due thought. No, I am in favor of the peasant truly becoming the master of the land and the master of the fruits of his labor. I am in favor of his truly choosing voluntarily his form of economic management, whether it be the collective farm or the state farm, or whether he independently sets up a peasant holding. In short, we need a really integrated approach, and we must both perfect the forms of management and ownership and strengthen in every way the material, technical and social base of the countryside.

The following question is asked by several comrades. Have I spoken, and have I spoken on many occasions, on issues connected with the strengthening of the economy and the decisions of the March plenum? As they say, now that Nikolay Ivanovich [Ryzhkov] has given his answers, it remains for me to say a few words on this. Yes, I have indeed been speaking on these matters, but at the same time I want with all responsibility to say that I also am well aware of how complex and difficult these issues are.

Historically, it has been the case that when we began to involve ourselves with industrialization, we did it in the main at the expense of the countryside. Then we created the atom bomb and secured military strategic parity. This also to a considerable extent proceeded, among other things, at the expense of the countryside. Then we made our way into space and that too was to a considerable degree at the expense of the countryside. Now surely, to put it crudely, certain people need to be pressured and made to give way and give priority to the countryside. There can be no other solution. This has to be a difficult but an extremely important political decision. [applause]

It is not a question here of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov not wishing to solve these issues. They are complex and difficult issues. I think that since the March plenum—please accept this as a very sincere declaration on my part—we have worked to some effect both at the congresses of people's deputies and in the Supreme Soviet, the government, the Central Committee plenum, and throughout the country. There were many speeches, comrades, including many by me, on turning the attention, in the final analysis, of society, the Supreme Soviet and the government to tackling such an extremely important task as providing the people with food. Probably we could have got through this in a shorter period than a year and a bit, but it was necessary to go through this stage. I am sure—and I am an optimist in regard to this—that we shall now move more quickly and find ways to solve the issues connected with the countryside. However this does not at all mean, comrades, that here at the center, locally and everywhere there is an understanding that food is what in the final analysis will ensure the success of the renewal of our country and perestroyka. No, in the best sense of the word we need to display vigilance and attentively follow these processes.

How do you envisage collective and state farms in the perestroyka era? I've already said that I see them as cooperatives of labor collectives with economic and management freedom. This process is in progress. I would like to stress that, aside from this, the question of the development of co-production between collective and state farms and peasant and family holdings is also now on the agenda. Co-production, agro-combines, agro-associations, and other associations should develop in every possible manner in this respect. A large number of questions deal with the development of social facilities in the countryside.

What ways do you see of halting the exodus of young people from the countryside, in addition to social ones? I consider that the main thing is to tackle social matters, plus the issue of working conditions—the work must be interesting for young people—and also concern for their future. That is my reply in brief to that question.

There is a large group of questions about how I envisage the practical handling of the food issue within the country, and whether I believe in the reality of our agrarian policy and plans. I wish to say in all responsibility, and this is based on the feelings I had in working on this for more than a year and a half, that I believe in the reality of the party's agrarian policy and I believe in the reality of our plans. I repeat once again that both must be done—we must improve production relations in every way, and provide reinforcement, powerful reinforcement, in the form of material, technical and financial resources.

There are several questions dealing with the struggle against drunkenness. Some of the questions say that trouble is again looming and this phenomenon, this great social evil, is spreading, while others again raise the question of uprooted vineyards and ruined enterprises. I would like to repeat the following in quite specific terms. In the period 1985-1989, annual uprooting of vineyards, by way of refurbishment, amounted to 11,000 hectares. That is even somewhat less than for the four years before the adoption of the decree. Yes. In some places in the republics, technical varieties were replaced with table grapes. But should people be reproached for this? After all, say what you will, we more than doubled the consumption of fresh grapes. Those are the facts, comrades. [Commotion] The rest is conjecture and the inflaming of passions, which we have enough of as it is. I would like to say this. [commotion; bell rings] Perhaps as a Siberian, I'm very fussy about this. But I grew up in Siberia, and I did not see fresh grapes for decades. Why was it? When I got involved in this, it turned out that 93 percent of all the grapes in 1985 was made into wine. And only seven percent remained for consumption as table grapes. We began this enormous work, which is no simple matter. It involves the creation of new technical resources and storage and transport facilities. And in three to four years we already had over 1 million tonnes of table grapes. In connection with this, there is a question about sugar production. I would like to report to you that as a result of intensive work by beet growers last year, we achieved the highest level of sugar production, which meant over 1,000,000 [as heard] more than 1988. We now have a sugar surplus 27 percent greater than last year. Certain comrades are raising the question of abolishing ration coupons. I think it is too early. We need to do more thorough work and increase sugar production, and then deal with the question of switching to normal sales of this important foodstuff.

A number of delegates ask that the specific names be given of persons pursuing anticommunist and antisocialist aims. Who is personally in the vanguard of these forces? I would not want to give you a whole list here, since you read the press a lot and you will know who they are. For instance, quite recently, in the latest edition of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, the well-known historian Afanasyev had an article in which he spoke frankly of his anticommunist goals and aspirations. Comrade Travkin has set himself the goal of struggling against the Communist Party. Other individuals are also well known. The comrades are also asking me to express my view on the conservative set-up of the party. I would like to repeat again what I said before. I am against organizing the CPSU on confederate principles.

I am in favor of its unity and of the communist parties of the union republics being part of it and having broad ,real, rights in their activities. Otherwise, comrades, the CPSU will have to leave the political arena and the Soviet Federation will disintegrate. That is the danger which is at hand in our society.

Some people ask me a question which has left me badly scarred, of course. This question relates to the accusation against me by Gdlyan and Ivanov. I would like to say just this: Replies to these questions have been given in the materials of the commissions of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, which were revealed on two occasions—at the second and third congresses, and also in the materials of the procuracy and the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

I wish to say once again that that was a genuine and pure political provocation, with the aim, in my view, of tying my hands in the political struggle. I must say to you that in all these years, as far as the content is concerned, they and many of their ilk have not managed to bring against me any specific accusations, only slander and lies.

The question is also being asked: What gives you strength and how did you manage to withstand this battle? I wish to say directly and with all frankness that I am generally a happy person, and this pleases me very much. In what sense? When that whole business began none of my friends and comrades—and I will tell you that I have lived through many decades—foresook me but gave me every help. I think that this alone makes life worth living. I receive very many letters [applause] and I think that this is what we call party comradeship. I receive many letters. What is more, the stream of letters is growing in which my comrades express support and the belief that I must be courageous and steadfast. I will put this to you bluntly: I am being inspired by the example of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin who used to say [some booing in the audience which suddenly turns into thin applause, which soon dies down] that despite many slanderous campaigns against him, he never opted to make deals with careerists and vulgar people. This is the viewpoint that I am holding too. And never of course will I trade in my own lot by making underhand deals with these people.

The next range of issues relate to the Tbilisi events. I wish to say it again, that I have already given a detailed answer to this question. My speech was published at the February plenum of the Central Committee, but since the delegates ask me this question I am prepared to repeat my answer.

The issue was discussed collectively with the participation of all Politburo members and candidate members who have endorsed the recommendations which had been elaborated during the first half of that very day by a whole group of Politburo members. Political decisions and recommendations were worked out to prevent the resurgence of the events that had occurred before elsewhere. I wish to say here something that I have never said before. The most suprising thing in this whole story, comrades, and not only in this story, unfortunately, is that none of the instigators and organizers of this sort of nationalist antics has yet been brought before the court. But as in a Krylov fable, nobody seems to be paying any attention. [applause] Yet, hundreds and thousands of people are dying and tens of thousands have been injured, and there are already almost 1 million refugees. Yet we are still seeking culprits in top leadership.

The notes making up perhaps the biggest group are those asking the question, what sort of perestroyka are you in favor of, Comrade Ligachev? I am above all in favor of socialist perestroyka. I am in favor of renewing society through the path of socialism. I am for genuinely scientific socialism, as Lenin saw it. And, by the way, I don't accept it when people say that Lenin, at the end of his life, resolutely changed his point of view on socialism. He did not change his point of view on socialism. All he changed was his view of the means and methods of building socialism. I understand perestroyka as the provision of an adequate material and spiritual life for the individual and the real participation of the working man in governing society. I want to say again that I am against private property, since I am sure it would put us back politically and socially. I am strongly against mass unemployment, and would like to repeat once again: Let him who is trying to push the country into free market relations become the first Soviet unemployed person. [applause]

On the party: I see no force other than the party and the soviets being capable of putting our country on the road to progress. I favor democratic centralism, and I stress the world "democratic." I believe that the role of the individual communist should be exalted, I would say, and that the broadest possible rights should be given to the primary organization. I support the territorial production principle in structuring the party's activities. I oppose the depolitíciation of the Army, the KGB, and the law enforcement agencies. I agree with the Lithuanian and Latvian comrades who have spoken here about repoliticization and seizure of power. To my mind, everything is clear here. They are dealing us a Trojan Horse, no more no less. [applause]

I am in favor of a dialogue with all social formations which do not undermine socialism or which strengthen it. I favor compromises, but oppose concessions on fundamental questions. I support an open, honest struggle of ideas within the framework of Soviet laws. I resolutely favor the strengthening of conscious discipline inside and outside work. I consider, comrades, that the experience of 1983 could be applied, so long as current circumstances are borne in mind. I regard it as a real force by means of which we could substantially reduce crime and speculation and strengthen law and order. [applause]

For the moment there is a lot going on, but it is all being done at headquarters level of commissions. Incidentally, one might well ask whether the country will ever escape from the boom in conferences and meetings. I don't have a magic wand I can wave. But maybe we should make it a rule to hold all meetings exclusively on Saturday and Sunday. That would probably reduce their number. [laughter and applause]

Finally, comrades, there are requests for me to comment on current reports in the press about a conspiracy within the Politburo, in the Army and society, about conservative forces which long for some iron discipline and an iron hand. I would like to say the following, comrades. The rumors about plots are being spread by destructive forces. I think there is one single reason for this. They want to distract society and the party from the destructive work they are engaged in, which poses a real rather than imaginary threat. To this end, they also paint a vivid picture of so-called conservative forces hankering after an iron hand. Yes, there are such people. But I repeat: The most serious danger comes, first and foremost, from antisocialist, nationalist, and separatist forces which are splitting party organizations, destroying the Soviet Federation and restoring the bourgeois order in individual republics.

Not infrequently, those very people who defend the party and socialism, and, as they say, devote all their strength and experience to practical work, who are restructuring this country not in words but in deeds, are also described as conservatives. I am strongly in favor of continuity in policy. This means that in the process of perestroyka, we should take account of the historical experience accumulated by the party in the building of a new society. I deeply regret that the point made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, that not a single one of those years had been a waste of time for our people, has not, unfortunately, been given exposure in the political work of our party.

It has to be understood, comrades, that people support perestroyka. They are proving this in their deeds. But they do not wish to reconcile themselves to disorganization of material and technical supplies, to the disruption of the consumer market, to speculation and crime, to fratricidal war and the casualties of it, to the fabrication of our history, or to the insulting of genuine culture and art. People just cannot put up with the excesses of immorality, and that includes what we see on television and in the cinema. I have had many meetings during my travels among the masses. I remember one question I was taxed with. [bell rings] I was simply at a loss for words when not just women but also men asked me, in tears, what ideals they were now supposed to inculcate in their children. [bell rings again, more loudly]

Finally, there are many questions—this is the last group of questions. I am asked about my plans. Some comrades bluntly suggest that I should retire. [exclamations from the floor] Others, on the other hand, support my positions—and there are quite a few of them—and insist that I remain in active political life. This is the sole question which I shall leave to you, comrades. [applause]

[Lazarev] Lazarev, mandate 1070. I have in my hand a stenographic report of the Russian inaugural congress of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party. Let me read from it: session of 20 June. Speech of Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev: The government measures on the transition to a regulated market economy were discussed neither in the Politburo nor at the plenum of the Central Committee. Session of 21 June; speech of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev: Radical economy reform, its necessity and concept were discussed at the June plenum of the Central Committee of the party and therefore, to consider that the idea came from out of the blue is slander. Would you care to comment on the word "slander." Thank you for your answer.

[Ligachev] Very well. By the way, please pay attention and hear me out. Both are absolutely correct [stir in the hall]. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke of the concept which we had examined two years back, and all that is authentic. But Ligachev spoke of the specific measures which the government had elaborated in accordance with that concept, and this was submitted to the Supreme Soviet without any preliminary examination either in the Central Committee of the party or in the Politburo.

Incidentally, I might mention that Mikhail Sergeyevich acknowledged that this fact, that we had not discussed it, was a blunder at the conference of the party oblast and kray committee first secretaries, and I think that this does him credit. It is not a matter of having it endorsed by the Central Committee or the Politburo, but it is quite right to raise it. There is a leading party with its leading bodies, and we are advancing by concrete measures, and the question naturally arose. But these questions should be discussed. I am sure that, while I may not be right in everything, if we had done so at the beginning there would have been far fewer difficulties in understanding this issue.

[(Rusinova]) (Rusinova) from the Perm delegation, mandate 8070. Yegor Kuzmich, much has been said in this auditorium about one of the problems of the countryside today, the unequal exchange between town and country. You have repeated this again. My question is whether there are any studies into a mechanism for equivalents in the town-countryside exchange.

[Ligachev] We examined these matters fairly recently at the agrarian commission of the Party Central Committee with the participation of specialists and leading economists. The method exists, as do alternative drafts and options also and we can complete this work very soon and embark upon an examination in the middle of the year and annually, as is the case in many other civilized countries, of matters of price levels for industrial and agricultural output, with the participation of the government, the peasants' union and the relevant ministries, departments and industrial associations.

Foreign Minister Shevardnadze

LD0807104590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1837 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Speech and questions and answers by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow; from the "At the 28th CPSU Congress" program—recorded]

[Text] [Shevardnadze] I am in the same situation as my other colleagues. I have received very many questions. About half of them are related, one way or another, with the events in Eastern Europe and the German problem. Opinions vary. Some think one thing, others something else. I do not think it is possible, and I will not try, to convert those who disagree with me in their assessments of the processes taking place in Eastern Europe and in connection with the unification of Germany. I set out my views on these processes in detail, both before the congress, in the press, and at news conferences.

I would merely like to say that foreign policy is not based on the views and positions of one person. I wish to stress this once again. The mechanism by which foreign policy decisions are made was explained in the speeches of Comrades Zaykov and Yazov and in my interview with PRAVDA. I stress once again that the Ministry of Defense—including the General Staff—the KGB, the International Department of the Central Committee, and other interested departments are involved in all decisions relating to the country's security and military questions. Furthermore, all decisions connected with Eastern Europe and German affairs were studied collectively and adopted at the level of the highest political leadership.

Delegate (Kirivil) accuses me of not telling PRAVDA the truth about my speech in Copenhagen, where I set out our position on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. The delegate writes: The USSR Defense Ministry was not involved in drafting your statement. Is this what you call another leap forward in raising our international prestige? A similar question is asked by Comrade (Rusay).

Let me remind you of what I said in Denmark. For a long time we have been proposing that nuclear armaments, including the nuclear component for dual-purpose weapons, as well as aircraft which carry nuclear weapons, be scrapped. Both Washington and we have called for talks to start as early as this autumn. To create favorable conditions for these talks, the Soviet Union will unilaterally reduce the number of its missile launch installations in central Europe by 140 and cut the number of its atomic weapons there by 3,200.

Comrades, can anyone seriously believe the minister of foreign affairs would say such things on his own? It means someone stands to benefit by casting aspersions upon the ministry, that somebody wants to do this. That is a different question. I have brought with me all these documents. I would ask the delegate to contact me during the break. I will show him they are signed by the minister of defense, the chief of the General Staff, the minister of foreign affairs, and all other comrades. Why do I attach such special importance to this? Because a similar statement was made at the Russian congress, at the congress of the Russian Communist Party.

In some of their slips of paper delegates ask me to answer the following questions.

How will things proceed further in Eastern Europe with the unification of Germany and with the world socialist system? Much has been said about Germany. Comrades, I want to appeal to you. We, each of us who appears on this platform, are exceedingly tense. This is a quite understandable feeling. Therefore, when (?one is not listened to at all) and there is noise in the hall, this without doubt hinders our proper working. I would ask, if this is not interesting, then I can refrain from speaking. This is another question, but everything must be...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Will we continue to listen to Comrade Shevardnadze's answers? [commotion in hall] We will. So please, otherwise many really do get the impression that everything is clear to many.

[Shevardnadze] Much has been said about Germany. I want the comrades to understand what possible alternatives there are here, not our wishes, but the viable alternatives.

First, achieving within the framework of the Two-Plus-Four mechanism, that is, of the six, and the pan-European process such an agreement on a definitive international legal settlement of the external aspects of German unity as would meet our security interests and correspond to the cause of stability in Europe. This is possible.

The second alternative: I am asked questions. Why do we agree to unification, and so forth? The second alternative: There is the possibility of blockading, stopping, but what forces and what methods would our half million troops in the GDR employ to blockade unification? One can well imagine what this would entail.

Cormades, we have chosen the first option. I think that all sensible people, all who do not wish to condemn both Europe and our people to a catastrophe, support us in this. Here is an answer to all who say that we should not have agreed to unification.

On the fate of the world socialist system: Comrade Yakovlev and others have talked about this. I will also say a few words. This is a major, complex question, and to a significant degree theoretical. Here clarity is needed in the very concept of the system. In our country, the construction of socialism was concluded. That was what we thought, and that was what we argued. Now we realize that we still have a long way to go. It is more correct to talk not about the system of socialism collapsing, but the system of a distorted concept of socialism. There have been and are socialist countries in the world, and they will develop. I do not doubt this.

Delegate (Dunkayev) writes: Proceeding from your assessment of the elimination of the worldwide system of socialism, as the process of the elimination of totalitarian regimes, do you believe, as a communist, in the historic perspective of the socialist path of development on the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism?

I cannot agree with that interpretation of what I was saying, but I will try to answer the second part of the question. I unconditionally believe in the socialist idea and the socialist path of development on the basis of the founding principles of Marxism- Leninism, which have freed it from models of the socialist idea alien to it, which lead to deadlock. The socialist idea has a historic perspective.

Delegate (Krasuchenko) writes: Who bears responsibility for the collapse of the Warsaw bloc and the camp of socialism as a whole? What is your role in this process?

The question is put directly. I will try to answer with the same directness.

A bloc which needed to be forcibly restrained from disintegration was not and cannot be a reliable support in serious matters. Will it not be better for our own security to rely on a union based on common interests? I see my duty as building new relations with neighboring allied countries and to make these mutually advantageous, good-neighborly and friendly so that we may cooperate fruitfully and interact closely.

Delegates (Panteley) and (Kazantsev) ask that we name our military-strategic allies today. I can guess what is behind this question. There were, it would seem, reliable ones before but now they are different. We lost our strategic allies, comrades, at the time—and previous speakers also spoke correctly about this—when force was used in Hungary in 1956, when we invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968, entered Afghanistan, and argued with China prior to the perestroyka years. And the crisis phenomena in Poland did not begin in connection with perestroyka but before perestroyka —you will remember this well. [applause]

Anxiety is expressed in notes on the subject of attitudes toward communists in the countries of Eastern Europe. The reproach is made that Soviet diplomacy is indifferent toward their fate. I understand that for many communists the events in their countries have been a very heavy blow, have brought them great burdens, and have sometimes even become personal tragedies. I sympathize profoundly with them and feel for them. If things go as far as persecution, diplomacy may, and will, quite in keeping with its principles, raise the issue of attitudes toward communists in all countries, within the context of human rights and within the framework of those obligations which states took upon themselves in accordance with the Helsinki Final Act, the Vienna Accords, and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. This is not only our right but also our duty. We will keep an eye on this and take the necessary measures.

Delegate (Diomin) asks what I see as being the fundamental distinction between the interests of, for example, the working class and universal human values. I think it would be more correct to speak about the correlation between class and common human interests. There are no contradictions between them. This is a correlation between the parts and the whole. The priority of common human interests implies that all normal people, irrespective of their differences, are committed to an equal degree to peace, prosperity and progress, the healthy condition of society and man, saving civilization from nuclear and ecological threats and the resolution of the problems of development.

A group of delegates is concerned by incidents of vandalism in relation to monuments and graves of Soviet servicemen in a number of countries in Eastern Europe. This really is a disgraceful and repulsive phenomenon and I understand the feelings which they arouse. Our embassies, consulates, and the ministry itself do not fail to react to a single such incident. They declare protests and attempt to bring about a rectification of the situation. The official authorities invariably distance themselves from such actions, make official apologies, and give assurances that they will take measures to end such acts and to punish the culprits. Since the German question is particularly sensitive in this regard, I would especially like to note that we specifically included in the document on the German settlement a separate point that the united Germany is to demonstrate respect for Soviet memorial sites and the graves of our soldiers.

There are also questions touching on the sums named by myself spent due to ideological confrontation and the possible peaceful dividend to be gained from the policies of the new thinking. These figures are estimates. They use data from other ministries and departments, statistical elaborations by scientific establishments and data from publications in our country and abroad. The final analysis was carried out by a specialized economic subunit of the ministry. The absolute minimum estimates were taken into account and attention was not paid to indirect economic losses. As far as the possible dividend is concerned, comrades, much there will depend on how we exploit the real opportunities which are opening up and how reasonably and competently we carry out the conversion of military production. Comrade Belousov quite correctly sharply raised these issues yesterday.

Delegate (Miroshnikov) asks whether the economic reforms which it is proposed to carry out in the country are not the object of political bargaining in the issue of the appropriate aid being granted to us by the West.

As has been said, comrades, we are not changing over to the market in order to get aid from anyone. That is clear. But we need cooperation with other countries so that it might be easier to get through the next very complicated and contradictory stage. There is no connection at all between the credit agreements and talks on other matters—the German question, on arms reductions—and I emphatically deny here any inference that some kind of bargaining is being done on the German question, just like any inference that somebody has given the GDR to Bonn, and thus decided its fate. The people of the GDR are deciding their fate for themselves, there is nothing else to it.

A number of comrades ask about the financial aspects of relations with the countries of Eastern Europe and possible losses in connection with the withdrawal of our troops. First, the allied countries have a total debt to us of R5.7 billion. At the midpoint of this year, we owed them R5.3 billion resulting from trade transactions. By the end of the year this figure could reach 6 or 7 billion.

In addition, we owe more than R4 billion for projects under construction in the USSR, with credit from the East European countries. Second, the value of installations for the Soviet troops built in East European countries with our own funds is assessed at several billion rubles, but nothing like tens of billions, as comrades write. Comrades, this is not a simple matter. The sides have differing interpretations of the legal status of our troops. There are also serious disagreements in the valuation of property, its technical status and compensation for environmental damage. We have to look into all this calmly and find mutually acceptable solutions at talks being held now by our military comrades and diplomats.

It is being asked how much the departure of our troops from the union republics—[corrects himself] from the allied states—will cost. It goes without saying, there will be certain, so to speak, expenditures, but theoretically this measure should yield an annual saving in the order of several hundred billion rubles.

Delegate Novikov asks: From whence comes the data in my report to the effect that we spent one-fourth of the country's budget on the Armed Forces? First, I was speaking of the past, of what was before. Second, we still need to get the bottom of this matter and tell our people the entire truth. It is no secret that of the country's many installations, expensive projects—such as railways and highways, airports, and others—were implemented as part of the creation of a military infrastructure. You know, I am not against this. Perhaps it is necesssary—we need to spend not every fourth, but indeed every second ruble, and every third ruble—but if we do so, let's say it for all to hear, so that people know what the money of the workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia is being used for. We can live in no other way. [applause]

Delegate Suslov asks whether I can give a professional forecast for the unfolding of events in Europe and in the world two, five, and ten years ahead. I can say that an assessment and planning directorate has been set up and is functioning in the ministry. I have already voiced some thoughts on this matter. I would only like to advise people to look closely at the processes which are already in progress in Europe and which were mentioned in the political report and partially in my address.

Serious decisions were adopted at the NATO council meeting which ended in London yesterday—let's put it that way. They still require study, so to speak, but I would like to voice a preliminary comment in this respect. They are evidence that NATO, too, is beginning to follow the path of transformation. As they state, the emphasis on the purely military aspect is being reduced. They intend to change their strategy—this is an official statement. What else do they say? It is necessary to [be] prepared to sign a declaration and state that the two alliances are no longer enemies and will refrain from threats or the use of force. NATO has expressed readiness to quickly complete the negotiations in progress in Vienna on conventional armaments and to start new negotiations on reducing troops in Europe, stating that an undertaking has to be given with regard to the ceiling on the strength of the armed forces of a united Germany. NATO has spoken for a limitation of the offensive potential of the armed forces in Europe, and for the start of the negotiations on reducing tactical nuclear armaments. Defense strategy on forward lines and the flexible response doctrine will be revised.

It has been stated that the doctrine providing for the possibility of using nuclear weapons is also being changed. NATO's position, and ours, with regard to the institutionalization of the common European process and the creation of security structures coincide in many ways, on the basic issues. So it is a question of serious steps taken to meet us; it is a question of important measures that will create a new military and political situation in Europe, and new relations between the alliances. We consider the London declaration to be a serious and important political act.

The chance is appearing to move a long way forward in strengthening stability and confidence in Europe and in the world. I want to make one remark in this regard, comrades. I was told that at the session—[bell rings]

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, the regulation time has run out.

At the session of the section several comrades alleged that the idea of a common European home is an illusion, a myth. If they think that, it means they are not noticing what is happening around us, they are closing their eyes to the real facts, the processes that are already underway in the construction of this common home and the common European space.

[Gorbachev] Thank you. The first microphone. [applause]

[Shevardnadze] There is (?If you want) another question. I cannot fail to answer this. It is a painful question for me. Communist Vasiliy Kirillovich (Molochko) sent in this note: How do you now evaluate your speeches to party congresses in the past, and your contribution to the creation of the Brezhnev phenomenon? What was it? Bootlicking" Careerism and all the rest of it?

I am glad that this question has been asked, since this did indeed happen. I spoke at both the 25th congress, and at the 26th, and words of praise were said about the then general secretary. But if the writer wants to understand my positions and my views well, let him look at the remaining parts of those speeches, too. Let him look at all my speeches at the Central Committee plena here, and my reports and speeches in Georgia. That was a period—and the Georgians, and not only the Georgians can confirm this—when we were starting a struggle, a very difficult struggle, against corruption, against bribery, against protectionism. You probably remember this, comrades. [applause]

That was a period, and Mikhail Sergeyevich can confirm this, and so can Nikolay Ivanovich—they came and looked at the experiments we were starting. We were then accused of moving toward capitalism. That was in the sphere of agriculture and industry, and in the towns and in the rural areas, and in transport and in the service sphere and so on and so forth. It was hard. It was dificult. At that time we called it, our philosophers called it, a moral revolution.

I recall the interest there was then in Moscow and in the other republics in these processes. I am proud of the fact that with the help and support of my comrades we started this difficult but sacred struggle. I must be fair. I did not know what was happening at the top, and none of us who now sit in the Politburo knew what state the country was then in. I knew one thing, that the then general secretary did not hinder me, and where necessary he supported me. I must say this. It would be unjust and dishonest on my part not to do so. [applause]

If we are going to root around for more things in the same view, I ask you to look: Our generation is one that had a tragic destiny. I remember how my contemporaries, my comrades, passed through the years of Stalinism. It was in those years that we grew up. I will open my soul to you and say I had a favorite vice of writing poems when I was a child, and I dedicated one of these poems to Stalin then—I was seven years old. Search round, that is the most serious argument against the current minister of foreign affairs. [applause] [bell rings]

[Gorbachev] Right, just a minute, just a minute. Shall we ask questions from the floor?

[Shevardnadze, showing slips of paper] There are some more.

[Voices from hall] No.

[Gorbachev] Right, thank you Eduard Amvrosiyevich. [applause]

Gorbachev on Politburo Voting

LD0807144290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1904 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Remarks by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the 7 July session of the 28 CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow; from the program "At the 28th CPSU Congress"—recorded]

[Text] All right, just a moment, just a moment! Shall we use the microphones to put questions? [shouting] Yes, thank you, (?yes, comrades). [applause] I ought to put you in the picture. Please sit down—it's the decision of the congress!

I ought to put you in the picture about the fact that a very large number of written messages have come in. They deal with two things. First, the comrades from Lugansk Oblast in the Ukraine have put in the largest number of messages. Evidently they had a discussion in their delegation. I'll read out one of them: I propose that we return without fail to the question of the personal assessment of the work of Politburo members. [shouts] I'll read on: Aside from the political harmfulness and undesirability of this, it should be done because the reports were heard but not discussed, and because there can be no question of any objectivity. It's all emotion. Apart from that, in the actual vote, the matter was put without discussion. If we continue to vote without discussion, on the spur of our emotions, on matters of far-reaching political consequence, we shall really have nothing to return home with. Please read this out. [applause]

The second message is from Kuybyshev: Comrade Kharitonov brought it up to me and asked me [to read it out] on behalf of the Kuybyshev delegation: I'm certain that none of the congress delegates will derive satisfaction from putting members of the Politburo on trial. Perhaps some people would get pleasure from it, but everyone must come to their senses and stop our congress from turning into mob rule. We are proceeding to a more civilized society, but people are beckoning us back to 1937. [applause]

And to end this topic ona philosophical note, delegate Verbilov from the local soviet delegation from Lugansk writes: I think the following should be read out. The great Azerbaijani poet Mirza Shafi Vazekh wrote as follows. Resounding speech sometimes fails to be brilliantly intelligent. Quiet speech is the speech of things. The working of destiny run silently, while the wheel of the globe thunders and grinds. Esteemed comrade delegates, isn't it time we heeded a wise man's counsel? [applause]

Two questions emerge from this. There are very many messages. The comrades are proposing that we stop hearing the reports, replies to questions put to members of the Politburo. [commotion]

So to go back to, [changes thought] the congress has the right, because no one is above it. But a decision was adopted on all these matters. So we must now adopt a position. First, shall we continue or shall we not continue? [commotion] Would delegates decide and express their view? Who wants to continue? Or who's against? I'm referring to the replies, the reports of the members and candidate members of the Politburo. [commotion] Shall we stop? Who wants to stop? Or are you against? [commotion] Well, then, it's clear. You'll express your view—some want to stop, others are against. We'll also put it to the others. [commotion] Alright. Calm down. Who wants to stop? I'll put to the vote the proposal that we end hearing the reports of members and candidate members of the Politburo. [vote takes place]

[Reporter] By a majority of votes, a decision was taken to end the reports by Politburo members.

The next matter put to the vote was the procedure for assessing the activity of the party leadership. It was decided to assess the activities of the Central Committee and Politburo as a whole. The second half of the evening session. Since the debate on the political report of the Central Committee and the procedure for report-backs by Politburo members, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed to delegates that they acquaint themselves with the resolution on the political report of the Central committee prepared by the drafting commission of the congress.

Vladimir Ivashko

LD0807224790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1910 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Remarks by Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, at the 7 July session of the 28th CPSU Congress held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow; introductory paragraph by unidentified correspondent; from the "At the 28th CPSU Congress" program—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Since the debate on the political report of the Central Committee and the procedure for report-backs by Politburo members had been completed, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed to delegates that they acquaint themselves with the resolution on the political report of the Central Committee prepared by the Drafting Commission of the congress. Delegate Ivashko is invited to speak:

[Ivashko] Esteemed comrades, first of all, on behalf of the congress Drafting Commission I would like to report to you on the situation concerning congress documents. First and foremost, the agenda as endorsed and the subsequently formulated congress instructions have made it necessary to prepare and discuss a whole series of very important documents, beginning with the program statement and the CPSU Rules and ending with resolutions on ways of getting the economy out of crisis or in defense of communists being subjected to persecution in certain foreign countries. All these documents are being prepared in parallel, in most cases from scratch, and by various groups of delegates elected to one congress commission or another.

At the moment most of the congress draft resolutions are being worked on. As to what conclusions or decisions will be arrived at by either the appropriate commissions or the congress as a whole, the Drafting Commission does not know. All the same, the time has come to discuss a resolution on the CPSU Central Committee political report. So, the Drafting Commission has found itself faced with a very difficult problem in its full magnitude, namely what proposals to put to the congress in these circumstances.

As you will recall, we have had several party congresses at which the main—if I can call it that—resolutions were very short, containing words of approval for the premises and conclusions of the report and carrying recommendations on how these premises might be implemented in party organizations' practical work. Evidently, such an approach now would be totally incorrect and would fail to reflect the very atmosphere of our congress. On the other hand, for the reasons given above, we cannot propose a resolution encompassing all the aspects of party activities. In view of this the congress Drafting Commission has come to the conclusion that perhaps, if congress delegates agree, we might limit ourselves to a kind of third option on the political resolution: One of the drafts, the last one we have, seven pages, in which it would also be possible to reflect those changes that have taken place in society after the 27th congress of the party in the course of restructuring, and those directions of work it seems to us it is mainly necessary to go by.

The only exception made here for the directions of the party's work is international activity. Set down in brief here are some appraisals for the simple reason alone that this aspect of matters was not reflected in other resolutions.

Another comment, or our view, I would like to express: During the congress, some delegates made the proposal to express unambiguous—I would say using the binary system—appraisals of the CPSU Central Committee' activity: satisfaction or not. The Drafting Commission tried diligently to find some kind of conclusion and to propose to the congress more rational proposals. Here we proceeded from the idea that recognition of work to be, say, unsatisfactory, would signify rejection of the course toward restructuring that has been implemented by the CPSU Central Committee [commotion in hall] A positive...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Let us listen. They have been thinking, and we will appraise...

[Ivashko, interrupting] A positive appraisal expressed in the resolution on the work of the CPSU Central Committee would blur those problems, shortcomings, and mistakes of the last years. In this connection, on this advice, the Drafting Commission is proposing a qualitative political appraisal. If you have no objections I will now read to you the draft that has taken shape among us today. [commotion in hall]

[Gorbachev] Is that all right? [affirmative response from the hall] We will listen and exchange ideas, and then...

[Ivashko, interrupting] Having heard and discussed the political report of the party's Central Committee delivered by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the congress notes that in the period following the 27th party congress profound changes in the life of society have taken place. The CPSU Central Committee, and the Central Committee Politburo, as a collective body of the political leadership were able to lift the party and all progressive forces of society to implement the country's revolutionary turn toward humanism, democracy, and social justice. The totalitarian, Stalinist system is being overcome and the emergence of a civilian society of free people based on socialist values is proceeding. The political system is being radically transformed. True democracy is being affirmed with free elections, a multiparty nature, and human rights. Real democracy is being reborn. State monopoly industrial relations that alienated working people from property and the results of their labor are being dismantled. Conditions are being created for free competition among socialist producers. The highly centralized state is being transformed into a truly union one, based on people's self-determination and voluntary unity. Ideological diktat is yielding to free-thinking, glasnost, and the information-openness of society.

The party decisions adopted during the period of restructuring provided an opportunity for practical actions to affirm the full power of the soviets, implementation of economic reform, creation of the legal foundations of a democratic state, and formation of new political thinking. All this involves millions of people in political life and facilitates the irreversibility of restructuring.

The fate of the party and its historical prospects are directly linked to its renewal, liberation from ideological dogmatism, and its mastering of the political art of attracting people by the force of truth, arguments, the ability to cooperate with other social-political organizations, but mainly, with real deeds.

The congress states the CPSU remains the party of socialist choice and communist future, a voluntary union of like-minded people that expresses by its policy the interests of the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, and all working people. This is inseparable from its adherence to universal human and humanist values and social justice.

The CPSU is a party of consistent internationalists who are sensitive to national interests, requirements, and customs and are intransigent regarding nationalism, chauvinism, racism, and any manifestation of reactionary ideology or obscurantism. The congress roundly condemns attacks on the character of Vladimir Ilich Lenin and his teachings, attacks that have recently become more frequent in our country. The vigorous defense of Lenin as a politician, thinker, and individual from cynical slander and defamation as well as from formulistic and bogus honors is the sacred duty of every communist and honest person. The congress rejects attempts to cultivate anti-communism and anti-Sovietism in society under cover of criticism of the deformations of socialism and the errors of the party. The congress opposes authoritarian thought and favors the creative development of socialist theory and a profound interpretation of the historical experience of the 20th century, the legacy of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and the achievements of international social thought.

The CPSU attaches priority significance to multiplying the intellectual wealth of society, which is expressed in science, education, and culture. The ideological and political integrity of the CPSU is ensured by recognizing the principles of self-government, freedom of action for party organizations, and the independence of the communist parties of the Union republics within the framework of the CPSU. The congress believes it a very important task to provide power for the CPSU's party masses in practice, the genuine influence of communists on party policy and a fundamental increase in the role of the primary party organizations.

In conditions of a multiparty system, the CPSU is prepared for open competition with other parties and movements on the basis of the law, which would include competition in elections and in parliamentary activity. The congress believes it is extremely important for party organizations to find a common language and forms of joint activity from the very beginning with the workers' and peasants' movement being revived in the country. The congress confirms the CPSU's drive for perestroyka as corresponding to the country's fundamental interests. The difficulties in its practical implementation are conditioned above all by underestimating the complexity of overcoming the legacy of the bureaucratic, command, and administrative system and unsatisfactory organizational and ideological provision in the decisions that have been developed.

The CPSU Central Committee, the Politburo, and the Secretariat of the Central Committee did not foresee the economic and moral consequences of specific steps. Many—including some major—actions were carried out unsystematically and without preliminary study in the party organizations. For this reason, important and necessary measures did not produce the expected benefits or even had the opposite effect. Monitoring compliance with decisions has effectively ceased to function. During the implementation of adopted resolutions, serious errors were made, many of the tasks set were not resolved, and new, unforeseen difficulties arose, which strengthened the features of the crisis and led to an exacerbation of the situation in society and the party.

The main demands of the 27th congress on the social reorientation of the economy and its turn toward people have not been achieved in the main. Serious social tension and the just displeasure of the population have led to the effective collapse of the consumer market, increased shortages, and depreciation of the ruble. The social and economic problems of the countryside have worsened. Many of the country's regions—Chernobyl, the Aral Sea, the Volga Basin etc., have become ecological disaster zones. The system of management has lost its efficiency. Lagging behind with the required transformation of the national state structure and the failure to make decisions in good time to solve the problems of relations between the nationalities have led to bitter conflicts, deaths, and the appearance of refugees.

The integrity and the very existence of the USSR have been threatened. The 28th CPSU Congress condemns separatist tendencies and striving for national isolation as going against the interests of the people. It expresses regret over the splits that have taken place in the communist parties of individual republics and states its full support for the position of Communist Party organizations that defend the socialist choice of society's development, human rights, the unity of the CPSU, and the Soviet Federation. The sharp weakening of state and labor discipline, the rise in crime, and the drop in public morals are causing acute anxiety and are complicating the political situation. The disastrous state of science, education, and culture present a danger to the country's present and future.

The congress notes that the CPSU leadership, having taken a decisive step to renew the party, has not implemented all possibilities from the state party, in the political leader, for its radical transformation. The CPSU Central Committee and party committees at all levels have not been able to restructure their work and to mobilize the creative potential of party organizations. The 28th CPSU Congress considers that the work of the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo and Secretariat require fundamental renewal. The Central Committee and its Politburo must concentrate main attention on key questions of ensuring the unity of the CPSU and development of democracy in the party: consolidation of unity and attainment of civil peace in the country by political means; the elaboration and practical implementation of urgent measures to take the country out of crisis.

The congress states that one of the most important achievements of perestroyka is political reform. New structures of legislative and executive powers have been created at Union, republican, and local levels. People's deputies have been elected by democratic means as a result of free, and in most cases, alternative, elections, and thereby the foundations have been laid for implementing the Leninist idea of the power of the people and the self-rule of the people in the form of local soviets. The historic duty of the CPSU is to take to its conclusion the practical transfer of all the fullness of power to the local soviets. Not everywhere have party committees set up cooperation with the new soviets. This is putting the brakes on the process of democratizing society and is hindering the establishment of soviets as a real power.

The constructive position of communist deputies and party organizations should promote the most rapid transfer of local soviets to full-blooded and normal work. The party has stopped monopolizing state and economic policy, but it can and is obliged to conduct its own analysis, to give its independent appraisals of situations, and to propose to society and state bodies its ways for getting out of the crisis, for stabilizing the situation, and for resolving glaring problems of everyday life.

The congress considers it correct and essential to introduce the institution of president of the country's political system, at the same time noting that the structure for mutual interaction between the president and the authorities in the republic and in the localities has not been legislatively put into shape, and the forms of control over the execution of decrees emanating from the president have not been defined.

The congress supports the international work of the Soviet state, which is based on the conclusions of the 27th congress and the 19th party conference. New thinking and its principles—freedom of choice, balance of interests, equality of rights and non-interference, mutual respect for independence and sovereignty, arms reductions, first and foremost nuclear, democratization and humanization of international relations on the basis of respecting human rights—have been put at the basis of the foreign policy program. Dialogue and political methods to find solutions for global international problems, ensuring security not through an arms race but through political cooperation and fulfillment of mutually undertaken obligations, integration of economies into a world economic system, ecological cooperation, diverse cooperation in the spiritual sphere, and broad dealings between peoples are becoming the norm.

The congress notes that the new foreign policy of the USSR built on these principles has facilitated a notable improvement in the international situation and a weakening of the threat of war, has brought results of principal importance, and has laid down the beginnings of a lowering of the burden of military expenditure. Favorable external conditions have been created to resolve internal tasks. The congress focuses special attention on foreign economic activity, the perfection of which could now seriously assist economic reform.

The congress favors expanding and deepening the CPSU's international links and stresses the importance of close cooperation with communist and workers' parties and with other leftist forces in a quest for spheres of coincidence of interests with a wide spectrum of political parties and social movements. The congress believes the CPSU program is not in line with the party's tasks and that it countermands its actions. The congress resolves to establish a commission to prepare a new party program and to submit its draft for discussion in the primary party organizations. The party congress draws the attention of all communists to whom the lofty right of being members of the central leadership of the leading organ of the CPSU will be entrusted to the impermissibility of repeating the errors of the past that led the party and society into crisis, the country into stagnation, and autocracy and socialism into deformations.

The country is living through a difficult time. The consolidation of all democratic forces is necessary as never before. The CPSU proposes to all supporters of the socialist idea to rally into a wide-ranging coalition in soviets, public organizations, and movements in their everyday practical activity. It is ready to conduct an equal dialogue, defending everything constructive in the name of the man of labor, civic peace, and accord among all nations. For its part, the CPSU proposes its program of action for the coming period to society and the state. It is set out in the program statement of the congress "Toward Humane Democratic Socialism," in the CPSU Rules, and in the resolutions on the most important problems of the country's development.

Report on Medvedev Remarks at 7 Jul Congress

LD0707154290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Report on remarks by Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, at the 28th CPSU Congress 7 July session held in the Kremlin's Palace of Congresses; from a report by correspondent Yuriy Korotkov]

[Text] [Korotkov] Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary for ideological questions, replied to questions. He said that 550 questions had come in addressed to him. He replied to some of them at the congress today. Here is what he said in reply to one rather tricky question from microphone number four.

[Begin recording] [(Tsepelevich)] Esteemed Vadim Andreyevich, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, when he spoke yesterday, warned us communists that soon we would receive the same treatment as in the countries of East Europe. Please forecast or guess where this process will first begin—in Moscow, Leningrad, or the Baltic region. (Tsepelevich), Estonian CPSU delegation.

[Medvedev] I think that our task here at the congress is not to make forecasts but to do everything to ensure that the party is preserved, that it preserves its positions, defends them actively, and of course, it is necessary to analyze processes. And this is being done although I must admit that serious forecasting work has not yet been organized in the party Central Committee. There are only individual, so to say, attempts and in individual areas. It seems to me that this is a very important task for the future leadership. [end recording]

Report on Kuptsov Remarks at 7 Jul Congress

LD0707162890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Report on remarks by Valentin Aleksandrovich Kuptsov, in charge of a section of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 28th CPSU Congress 7 July session held in the Kremlin's Palace of Congresses; from a report by correspondent Yuriy Korotkov]

[Text] [Korotkov] Kuptsov, in charge of a section of the CPSU Central Committee, reported on the work of the section on the party, soviets, and public organizations and movements. The main idea of all those who spoke at the section is that the CPSU should cooperate with those new parties and movements which proceed from socialist positions. The delegates were worried that the party is coming in for abuse, that it is portrayed as an antidemocratic party and that all errors are piled at its door. The party ought to interact more closely with the new public parties and associations, with the trade unions, Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], and women's organizations. This is what he had to say about the way in which the work of the party and the soviets ought to be developed:

[Begin Kuptsov recording] Many delegates noted that the work of communists within soviets at various levels represents the main direction of development of public dialogue. Hence, the CPSU's attitude toward the soviets is unequivocal. The communists should use all their authority, all their potential of influencing the masses in order to fight, in the soviets, for the adoption of essential laws and decisions, capable of renewing and democratizing our public life and, most important, to unite their work to get them implemented.

Those who spoke at the section, Comrades (Polikarpov) from Archangel Oblast, (Gevorshkon) from Krasnoyarsk Kray, and (Kosyrev) from Cherkessy Oblast, said the idea of divorcing its own influence from the powers of the soviets is an idea alien to our party. They, along with many others, are of the view that the soviets and the party have nothing to divide in the present-day society—but, instead, there are enormous possibilities for cooperation. At the same time, communists must assimilate the difficult science of taking part in elections, in the work of new parliamentary structures and, at the same time, they must draw lessons from bitter reverses.

The delegates noted that the fact that the soviets have joined in the process of an in-depth, internal perestroyka represents the fundamental distinguishing characteristic of the soviets' present development. [end recording]

TASS Summarizes 7 July Session

LD0707122690 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 7 Jul 90

[by TASS correspondents Lev Aksenov and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow July 7 (TASS)—Thursday's meetings of participants in the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress in seven working groups allowed the party fuller to take into account delegates' views. This morning, the congress heard brief reports about discussions in those working groups.

The work of the group focussing on the party's renewal evoked the strongest interest. Some 1,200 delegates took part in its work, said Ivan Melnikov, secretary of Moscow State University Party Committee.

"Central to delegates was the issue of implementing the thesis of the power of the party masses," Melnikov said. In this regard, a proposal was put forward to make routine the holding of party referendums on all-important issues.

Melnikov said that the working group called for preserving the post of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the Politburo and Central Committee in the structure of the party's governing bodies.

In the opinion of Ivan Frolov, CPSU Central Committee secretary and editor-in-chief of the PRAVDA newspaper, "keen discussions were held in the group focusing on ideological work. The debates passed in a constructive atmosphere."

Although the party leadership came under fire for lgging behind in the ideological work, speakers in the group emphasised that "the all-important thing had occurred during perestroyka: a genuine revolution in the minds took place, the ideology of renewal, the theory of perestroyka began to shape, although this process needs to be deepened and expedited," Frolov said.

"Mindful of the acute situation in the party and many issues that remain unresolved, delegates proposed to hold shortly a Central Committee plenum on ideology, launch a theoretcial discussion in the party, and accelerate the work on a new CPSU programme so as to present its draft to the regular party congress in 1991," Frolov said.

"Some 900 delegates took part in the work of the group centering on the socioeconomic policy," said Ukrainian Communist Party Chief Stanislav Gurenko. According to him, the discussion reflected deep concern about the state of society, the gravity and urgency of problems which are uppermost to millions of people today.

Gurenko focussed on the assessment of the government programme for the transition to the market. Delegates called for developing a reliable mechanism of man's social protection. A proposal was aired to "charge communists working in the government and in legislative bodies with elaborating within the shortest possible time a programme to implement economic reform that will be understandable to all."

USSR Peasants' Union Chairman Vasiliy Starodubtsev informed the congress about the work of the group discussing the agrarian policy and its results. He said Gorbachev and Ryzhkov's participation in the group's work emphasised the importance of this aspect of policy.

"In evaluating the causes of crisis in agricultural production, speakers noted that they were long-standing, tracing them to the extremes of collectivisation," Starodubtsev said.

On problems faced by the agrarian section, Starodubtsev underlined the need for the equality of all forms of economic management. He altered delegates to a great many social problems in the countryside, remaining unresolved and called for the unification of constructive forces that can pull society out of the moral crisis and shortages.

The CPSU is alien to the idea of opposing its influence to the soviets' authority. This is the main conclusion drawn by the group, which focussed on the party, soviets, sociopolitical organisations and movements.

Speaking on behalf of the group, CPSU Central Committee Department head Valentin Kuptsov emphasised that the soviets and the party had nothing to divide, but they had vast opportunities for cooperation. He added that communists had to master the diffiuclt science of participation in elections, in the work of new parliamentary structures, and simultaneously draw lessons from bitter defeats.

Heated debates on having secretaries of party committees to serve simultaneously as chairmen of governing councils (soviets) at all levels failed to narrow differences of opinion, Kuptsov said. Delegates agreed with the norm of forming communist groups and factions in the soviets, working under the leadership of respective party committees, that is proposed in the draft new rules.

The party should become an organisation that expresses the national interests of all ethnic groups in the USSR, overcome the excesses it had in the nationalities policy, and match these commitments with deeds, Central Committee Secretary Andrey Girenko proposed upon the results of the work of the group that dealt with the party's nationalities policy.

Girenko said that participants spoke with concern and pain that the undeclared civil war was going on in the country. The number of killed and wounded is countered in thousands, the number of peace-time refugees exceeded half a million.

Speakers sharply criticised the party Central Committee and union agencies for "inconsistency and tardiness in fulfilling their own decisions, for a gap between word and deed."

As a result of the intense polemics around the thesis about the priority of human rights over the rights of nations, delegates formulated the following stance: "The CPSU, recognising the value of the national forms of society's life and defending the rights of nations, puts human rights on first place.

The urgent issues of the foreign policy of the party and state, the pivotal elements of the country's past and a forecast for the future were the subject of a thorough exchange of views in the working group centering on the CPSU's international activity. A report on the group's work was made by CPSU International Department head Valentin Falin.

Noting that speakers in the group did not call in question the party's general line in foreign policy, Falin said at the same time that "communists made many critical judgements concerning the tactic of implementing the party's foreign policy. Different and sometimes opposing approaches to handling several issues were laid down," Falin stressed.

He said speakers emphasised the importance of the USSR's new approaches to international affairs and the need to cleanse the country's foreign policy of dogmas. The discussion was concentrated on the interaction of internal and foreign policies at the present stage, security problems, the situation in East Europe and the German questions.

The floor at the congress was then given to party leaders.

'Heated' Debate Over Resolution

LD0707171890 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 7 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondents Boris Zverev and Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS—After hearing reports made by the top political leaders of the country, delegates devote today's evening session, at the suggestion of Gorbachev, to working out a resolution on the political report of the Party Central Committee.

Vladimir Ivashko, chairman of the Editing Commission, said that the commission found itself in a rather difficult situation, because some delegates suggested giving a one-word assessment of the Central Committee's performance—"satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." However, to describe its performance as unsatisfactory would mean to reject the perestroyka course, while a "positive assessment would fail to mention problems, defects and miscalculations."

Ivashko read out to the delegates a compromise version of the draft resolution for a preliminary discussion. It said that after the 27th party congress the Central Committee and the Politburo "managed to inspire the party and all progressive forces of society to the implementation of a revolutionary turn of the country towards humanism, democracy and social justice." The draft resolution reiterated the party's course towards perestroyka, because it "meets the country's basic interests."

At the same time, it stressed the need for a radical renewal of the activities of the Central Committee, the Politburo and the Central Committee Secretariat. The discussion of the draft resolution revealed a wide range of opinions—from the readiness to adopt it as a basis immediately to its complete rejection.

The question whether the resolution should or should not include the assessment of the performance of Politburo members evoked an especially heated discussion. Aleksandr Lobutov, a party functionary from the autonomous republic of Tataria, pointed to the correctness of the course towards the restructuring of Soviet society, but suggested that the practical work of Politburo members for its implementation should be described as unsatisfactory.

It was pointed out during the discussion that many resolutions of the 27th party congress and the 19th Party Conference had not been fulfilled and others had become obsolete because of the dynamic development of political events in the country. Many delegates insisted on cancelling a resolution on the feasibility of combining the posts of the party leader and head of state. Others argued that these suggestons are a "serious political mistake."

The delegates' suggestions and remarks will be taken into consideration by the Editing Commission during the working out of a final version of the resoluton. A decision on this issue will be taken on Monday.

Ligachev, Shevardnadze Cited

LD0707152990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1422 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow 7 Jul (TASS)—TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Vladimir Isachenkov reports from the Kremlin:

At the 28th CPSU Congress' evening sitting, before continuing the answers to delegates' questions by Politburo members, Mikhail Gorbachev, who had taken the chair, called on the congress to think over once again the decision adopted before the break to give each Politburo member a personal assessment. Expressing his own attitude to that decision he said, "if you want to bury and split up the party, then carry on along that road."

After this, the floor was given to Yegor Ligachev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, to answer questions. In particular he stated that the rumors about plots by conservatives who yearned for the "iron fist" are being spread by antisocialist, national-separatist forces. In his words, these forces are striving to distract attention from the destructive work which they are conducting, "splitting party organizations, destroying the Soviet federation, and restoring the bourgeois order in individual republics."

Yegor Ligachev came out in favor of "strengthening conscious discipline of work and life," stressing that "one could make use, while taking account of current conditions, of the experience of 1983" (Yuriy Andropov at that time started a campaign to strengthen discipline).

Replying to a question from the hall, the speaker stated that within the Politburo's composition he "had felt well in the first three years of perestroyka when things were going considerably better for us ... the political prestige of the party was increasing. Now, just like you, I feel concern. I took on the agrarian sector because this is an extremely difficult section, although I did not take it on voluntarily."

Speaking about his attitude to a regulated market economy, Yegor Ligachev stressed that private property would throw Soviet society backwards politically and socially. He proposed that those who, in his words "are pushing the country into free market relations" should become the first Soviet unemployed.

Formulating his own views on the CPSU's organizational structure, the speaker said that he is "in favor of democratic centralism, extolling the individual communist, and granting the most extensive rights to the primary organisations and against the 'Trojan horse', i.e. depoliticization of the army, the KGB, and the law and order bodies." He favors dialogue with all public formations which "do not destroy socialism but strengthen it."

In answer to questions from congress delegates about his attitude to the reunification of Germany, Yegor Ligachev said that "it is not unification but at best annexation and overall a case of the FRG swallowing up the GDR." "I am profoundly convinced that these matters should be considered within our society in state, party and public organizations. Let the people give their opinion," the speaker said.

Eduard Shevardnadze, Politburo member and USSR foreign affairs minister, then took the floor.

The events taking place in East Europe, the process of the unification of Germany and the USSR supreme political leadership's position regarding this—these subjects were touched on in the overwhelming majority of questions put today to Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and foreign minister, by congress delegates.

The minister explained that all decisions concerning the problems of East Europe were made at the level of the USSR's supreme political leadership. Speaking of Germany's unification, he stressed that the USSR chose a course toward achieving within the framework of the two-plus-four mechanism the kind of agreement which would meet the requirements for ensuring the security of both the USSR and stability in Europe as a whole. The speaker resolutely rejected hints that there is "a kind of bargaining on the German question taking place, that someone had 'given' the GDR to Bonn and thereby decided its destiny." The GDR people decide their destiny for themselves, he stressed.

The speaker called the events in the East European countries "a major and complex issue." "It is not socialism that has crashed, but the system of distorted ideas of socialism. But socialist countries have existed and do exist in the world, and they will develop—I have no doubt of this," the minister stated.

Replying to a question concerning responsibility for the "disintegration of the Warsaw Bloc and of the socialist camp as a whole," the minister stated: "A bloc which had to be prevented by force from disintegrating was not and cannot be a reliable foundation in serious affairs." For the security of the USSR, he said, it would be better "in future to rely on an alliance at the heart of which lie common interests."

Is the USSR Foreign Ministry indifferent to the communists in the countries of East Europe? Replying to a note containing this question, Shevardnadze said that "if things get as far as persecutions, then diplomacy can and will with all principledness, raise the question of the attitude toward communists in all countries within the context of human rights, and within the framework of the obligations which states have taken on under the final act in Helsinki, under the Vienna accords, and under the universal declaration of human rights. This is not only our right, but also our obligation. We shall keep an eye on this and take the necessary measures," he stated.

The minister called the decisions made at the NATO Council session which ended yesterday in London "serious." They attest, the speaker went on, that NATO too is beginning to go along the road of transformation and is reducing the emphasis on the purely military aspect. "The positions of NATO and the USSR with regard to institutionalizing the all-European process and creating security structures coincide, to a great extent, on all the main issues," he said. "In this way, it is a matter of serious steps toward us and of major measures that will create a new military and political situation in Europe and new relations between the alliances."

The minister noted that the USSR regards the London Declaration as "a serious and important political act. The opportunity is emerging of making great headway in strengthening stability and confidence in Europe and throughout the world," he added.

Touching upon the claims of certain deputies who call the idea of a common European home "a myth and an illusion," Eduard Shevardnadze said: "To think this means not noticing what is going on all around and closing one'e eyes to real facts and to the processes already under way in building that common home and all-European spaces."

When Eduard Shevardnadze had finished his speech, the Congress delegates, at the suggestion of Mikhail Gorbachev, voted to stop the hearings of the party leaders. It was decided to give an overall assessment of the activities of the CPSU Central Committee and the Politburo.

TV Reviews Congress Morning Session

LD0707164690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 7 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer Sergey Medvedev] Good evening. The party theme will be one of the main ones in today's bulletin, since Saturday is a working day for the delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress. We asked our special correspondents, who have been following its work in the Kremlin since early morning, to tell us how it is going. So we are going over the Palace of Congresses:

[Correspondent Vladislav Flyarkovskiy] Since this morning there have been seven reports on the work of the congress's seven sections. Subsequently the floor was made available for answers to questions by three members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, only three of them so far. These were Comrades Ryzhkov, Yakovlev, and Medvedev. Before they spoke, the question of whether a personal assessment of the work of every member of the Politburo should be made was raised again. The delegates called for a personal assessment to be made of the work of Politburo members.

Now I will present Anatoliy Semenovich Yeremenko, chairman of the Semipalatinsk Oblast executive committee; Keshirim Boztayevich Boztayev, first secretary of Semipalatinsk Obkom; and the poet Olzhas Suleymenov, a representative of the Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement. The word Semipalatinsk has again been heard a lot at the Congress, has it not?

[Suleymenov] Yes, two points of view have been heard again. Some favor the closure of the testing ground. Others say tests should continue at that site and give figures in support of their case. Their main argument is that there are 350 cases of oncological illness for every 100,000 people in the United States, whereas there are only 208 in Semipalatinsk which they believe to be the healthiest place in the world. All this proves, perhaps, is that our diagnostic service is worse than in the United States. Maybe that is the explanation. But without going into these details and nuances, let us say just one thing: The republic and the entire people have decided at all levels that the testing ground must be closed.

[Boztayev] I have come to a single conclusion, that nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk site must stop immediately.

[Flyarkovskiy] Is there anything to be said for the continuation of nuclear tests? Is there anything in it for the region itself, so to speak? As a representative, as the leader even of Soviet power in the oblast, can you say anything about this? Besides harming people's (?lives), does it do them any good?

[Yeremenko] During the 40 years nuclear weapons have been tested on our territory, neither the government of the Union nor the military authorities have driven a single rusty nail into the region.

[Flyarkovskiy] But the party congress can hardly pass an immediate decision on this question as a matter of urgency.

[Yeremenko] We are aware of this. Nevertheless, we think the party congress should adopt some sort of decision. [video shows delegates in main foyer of Kremlin Palace of Congresses. Interview with group from Semipalatinsk]

Deputies Heed Gorbachev Warning on 'Split'

LD0707151290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1342 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Report by correspondent Yakov Smirnov]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Our listeners will no doubt be interested to hear that at the congress today the reports of the heads of the six sections were discussed—we've already reported this on the air—and replies were heard to questons delegates put to Politburo members Comrades Ryzhkov, Medvedev, Yakovlev, Ligachev, and Shevardnadze. The delegates wanted to give a personal assessment of the political activity of each of these leaders, and they even voted for this. But then an extraordinary occurrence took place at the congress—I don't know what to call it. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorabchev did not agree to this. He said to delegates: If you want to bury the party and to cause it to split, then follow that path.

And you know, quite honestly, in my mind the intention of giving personal assessments had the connotation of some sort of civil execution. On the other hand, it seemed strange to me that the congress, which had just voted for personal assessments, immediately decided not to make such assessments after the general secretary had intervened.

So I decided to ask the delegates the reason for such a change. At the microphone now I have Yuriy Dmitriyevich Chernichenko, secretary of the board of the USSR Union of Writers. Go ahead please, Yuriy Dmitriyevich:

[Chernichenko] I have to tell the truth, and I shall tell it as I see it: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was trying to stop them meting out punishment. I don't want you to think I'm saying this just for effect, because during the debate on the report or let's say Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev's replies to questions, I was in a state of extreme discomfort, I was suffering, one might say. [passage omitted]

[Chernichenko continues] There are elements of such a deviation here, such a Thermidor, you know, such grossness at times that you wonder whether we really have lived through these years, have we really had these upswings of morality, spirit, and liberation. I think this will not go unpunished for the party. This punishment you mentioned, or the bogus trials, were prevented by Mikhail Sergeyevich in particular perhaps because they are simply unobjective when there are 4,000 or more of them against one individual. Yegor Kuzmich [Ligachev], for instance, accounting for his actions and talking about the scandalous, so to speak, anti-alcohol move was improper—to put it mildly—as regrads the destruction of the vineyards. We are all perfectly aware that it was under his leadership that brilliant treasure-troves were destroyed, the vineyards of Crimea and Moldavia. Here things were presented completely inside out and with such panache that the truth could only look on hopelessly and justice, or Themis could, as the tradition goes, do nothing but close its eyes firmly shut. [passage omitted]

Politburo Question Session 'Very Tumultuous'

LD0707233190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Report on the 7 July CPSU Congress session by commentator Lyudmila Semina]

[Text] Today's session of the congress began on a disturbing note. At the request of the Belorussian delegation, the floor was given to Yurchenko, a school headmistress from Gomel Oblast, who spoke with pain and concern over unresolved—and still not being tackled—issues connected with ensuring normal living and working conditions for people in those areas of Belorussia affected by the Chernobyl accident, the reasons for the crisis of trust in the party, and how these issues are being tackled. The Belorussian delegate recalled that she should soon be returning to her native region and unless fundamental decisions are adopted, including decisions on the problems of Chernobyl, they would have no answers to give to people.

Next, the congress heard reports on the work of sections on Thursday 5 July. As you know, they discussed vital issues of party life—renewal of the party, the party's socioeconomic policy, agrarian policy, ideological issues, and problems of ethnic relations. I shall speak in more detail about these reports in the next bulletin at 2200 hours [1800 GMT]. The only thing I would like to say is that this detailed discussion in sections helped find optimal formulae and formulations for the congress to adopt decisions.

Today's discussion of the reports by CPSU Central Committee Politburo members at the congress was very tumultous. Delegates' questions—of which there were many hundreds—were answered by Comrades Ryzhkov, Medvedev, Yakovlev, Ligachev, and Shevardnadze. Then, at the request of a number of deputies, it was decided to stop the discussion. But first things first.

Around 600 questions were put to Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. Too many he replied in writing, but today too the congress participants asked questions from their seats. Here's a brief extract:

[Begin recording] [Ryzhkov] I would just like to dwell on one issue to ensure that nothing goes unsaid between us here. Many comrades are asking what I think of the words contained in the political report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, about it being absurd to begin the transition to a market economy by raising prices. I have spoken with Mikhail Sergeyevich on this issue, and I think there is evidently a certain imprecision here that has given rise to all this talk. I also believe it absurd to begin the transition to the market with price rises alone—and I stress, alone. One cannot take such a view of the market economy, and one cannot take such a view of our further development in general. So if the word only is included, this is fully in line with our plans. Our entire transition to the market is a comprehensive program; one cannot stop at prices alone. So in this respect, I believe there is complete understanding. There are proposals on prices; this is the most acute issue and we cannot get away from it. I have ten minutes left, so if the comrades have any questions, I am ready to answer.

[Koltsov] Koltsov, Sverdlovsk party organization. Esteemed Nikolay Ivanovich, in his speech Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev complained that three times at the Politburo he brought up agrarian issues and that those issues were not discussed. I'd like to know why.

[Ryzhkov] This issue was repeatedly raised at the Politburo and, you know, at the March plenum last year. Comrade Ligachev did indeed pose the question that we had to define our position on capital investments for the coming 5-year plan. The agro-industrial complex needs to know the volume of capital investments that must be channelled, as they say, into the development of rural areas.

My statement—and I spoke to the country's agrarians the day before yesterday—is the following...[pauses] This is my view: that the agro-industrial complex really must be given priority for the next five year period. It must be given priority, but we must all realize as we leave here that if we give the agro-industrial complex priority—and this must be done or else we shall not solve our agricultural problems—we shall have to put the squeeze on somewhere else, in terms of fulfilling our programs, as it were. But I can tell you that the starting figures when the plan was being drawn up were, for the social sphere, for instance, R80 billion to be allocated in this five year period... to the social sphere in the countryside...but we are planning 120. But will the development of the national economy be reinforced by our proportions? Let's do a few months' work now, and then make our minds up. So it is not a matter of fundamental disagreement. [end recording]

Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev was more energetic than ever before today. One felt that he had reached conclusions after his unsuccessful speech at the congress, which was received sceptically by the delegates. Here's one of Comrade Medvedev's answers:

[Begin Medvedev recording] Comrade Galkin from Moscow Oblast asks: How could it happen that since your arrival in the Politburo, the party's entire ideology has been totally destroyed? [noise in hall] [words indistinct] your involvement in the collapse of the CPSU? What personal responsibility are you prepared to bear for the present political crisis?—[Gladyshev]. We ask Vadim Andreyevich to explain specifically why ideological work in the party has deteriorated sharply. Answer the qeustion—What has made it possible to wreck ideological work in the party to such an extent?

Well, as you can see, there are no doubts, reflections, or uncertainties at all in these questions—they merely express the opinion that ideology is finished and that's that. And according to these notes, no new ideology, the ideology of perestroyka, has been created. Of course, this is all scathing and quite painful, but let's think a little and get to the bottom of things. Are we not getting into a somewhat false position with such an assessment—I don't mean of my personal work, but of the ideology? The question arises, 'what kind of ideology was it, if it could be wrecked so quickly by one man? [applause] What ideology has been wrecked, if no new ideology has been created? If by the old ideology is meant the ideology of Stalinism and stagnation, then perhaps it's not such a bad thing. We must realize this. It turns out that in the old days, when hypocrisy and deceit reigned in ideology, stagnant thinking and dogmatism and narrowminded thinking, there was, of course, a tremendous discrepancy between words and deeds and shameless limitations on glasnost, and ideology flourished; whereas, now that we are ridding ourselves of all that and have taken the path of renewal, ideology has collapsed. Are not assessments displaced here, comrades? Do they not reveal a nostalgia for the past? Are not the death throes of the past being mixed with the birth pangs of the new? Of course, I do not mean to say by this, and do not by any means wish to embellish, the situation in ideology. [end recording]

At the congress, on several occasions already, we have heard very sharp assessments of the activities of the mass information media, and above all of the newspapers MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI and ARGUMENTY I FAKTY and the journal OGONEK. Asked what he thinks of these publications, Comrade Medvedev said he took a critical view, particularly toward articles which wage, as he put it, unbridled propaganda against our party. Comrade Medvedev also answered a number of questions on culture.

Politburo Member Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev said that he would answer only the critical notes, which outnumbered those from well-wishers. Many questions concerned his working trips to the Baltic republics and his statements there on ethnic issues. The delegates asked him directly what responsibility he bears for the events in the Baltic republics and for the split in the parties. Comrade Yakovlev replied by quoting statements he made during his stay in Vilnius and Riga—well-considered and just remarks. But in the sharp criticism from the congress delegates, one could sense our former tendency to look for enemies, as if it was not the party's own mistakes that led to such consequences in the Baltic republics, in particular, but Comrade Yakovlev's speeches, there. And there was one other group of problems:

[Begin Yakovlev recording] There are many questions on Eastern Europe. Comrades, I agree with the assessments made in this connection both in Mikhail Sergeyevich's report and in the speech, or report, by Comrade Shevardnadze. The causes are specific to each country and common to all states. If the people turns its back on the party, this is a matter for the people; it means that the policies of those parties are not perceived by them as their own popular policies. And it was not only a matter of anti-socialist forces, which, of course, are obvious and visible to all of us, but the main thing was people's attitudes and the attitudes of the mass of communists. The analysis is still to be made, but comrades, when they say or blame the Central Committee for the collapse of the socialist system at this very time, we must remember what happened in Berlin in 1953, in Hungary in 1956, and in Czechoslovakia in 1968. I was in Czechoslovakia in 1968, restoring the foundations of socialism, so to speak, and to this day I feel uncomfortable about that mission. We must look into things deeply, however, comrades. Did we not have a break in relations with China, Albania, and Yugoslavia before perestroyka? One must not bury or hasten to bury socialism in Eastern Europe. If substantial elements of socialism are now taking root in the West too, especially in the central sphere, they will make their mark in these countries as well. But you cannot get away from life; you cannot by a decision of the Central Committee annul the fact that industry has increased ten times faster in South Korea than in North Korea in recent years, or that living standards in West Germany are considerably higher than in East Germany. Can you and I here, even at the congress, really resolve these issues? No, we cannot. [applause]

We must, of course—and one of the note writers is correct when he says that normalization in Europe has objectively reduced our role as a military guarantor and leader. I would say, comrades, that I agree with this, but this normalization of the situation in Europe has reduced not only our role, but also that of the United States, as military guarantors and leaders in Europe, and I think this is a good thing. As we have said more than once, each party bears responsibility first and foremost before its own people and its own country for the policies it pursues, and I think we ought to take, or it is time to take, seriously the words non-interfererence in internal affairs. I have recently had meetings with Comrade Gysi, Comrade [name indistinct], Comrade Miller, and Comrade Lilov. Of course, they are in a difficult position, but they are not in the least losing hope for the future, but saying that they really do need to restructure, to go to the masses and earn authority among the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligenstia, whom they have lost. [end recording]

The aggressive mood in the hall indicated, I think, that in the well-known words of Nina Andreyeva, many to this day cannot waive their principles, although a large number of the delegates who are obviously of democratic orientation support Comrade Yakovlev's policy. The appearance on the platform of Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev was greeted quite differently. He got possibly the most applause and the most time. Here is the range of questions to which it thought it necessary to give answers: the agrarian policy of the CPSU and the situation in agriculture; the collective and state farms in the age of perestroyka; questions in connection with the notorious anti-alcohol campaign. They were questions about the accusations against Comrade Ligachev by the Galyan-Ivanov group, and about how far he was involved in the decisions preceeding the events in Tbilisi. Evidently not all his anwers seemed sufficiently convincing, since after the 20 minutes allotted, Yegor Kuzmich had to spend the same lenght of time replying to oral questions from the hall. I will give you first the part of his speech today which concerns his general views:

[Begin Ligachev recording] The notes making up perhaps the biggest group are those asking the question, what sort of perestroyka are you in favor of, Comrade Ligachev? I am above all in favor of socialist perestroyka. I favor renewing society through the path of socialism. I am for genuinely scientific socialism, as Lenin saw it. By the way, I do not accept it when people say that Lenin, at the end of his life, resolutely changed his point of view on socialism. He did not change his point of view on socialism. All he changed was his view of the means and methods of building socialism. I understand perestroyka as the provision of an adequate material and spiritual life for the individual and the real participation of the working man in governing society. I want to say again that I am against private property, since I am sure it would put us back politically and socially. I am strongly against mass unemployment, and would like to repeat once again: Let him who is trying to push the country into free market relations become the first Soviet unemployed person. [applause]

On the party: I see no other force than the party and soviets that is capable of bringing our country to progress. I am for democratic centralism and I mean democratic; for what I would call extolling the personality of the communist and giving the widest powers to the primary organizations; for the territorial-industrial principle of the building of the party's activities; against the depoliticizing of the army, KGB and law enforcement agencies. I agree with the Lithuanian comrades who have spoken here about re- politicization and seizure of power. Here I think everything is clear: We are quite simply having a Trojan horse foisted upon us. [applause] I favor conducting a dialogue with all public formations that are not destroying socialism, but strengthening it. For compromise, but against concessions on matters of principle. For an open and honest struggle of ideas within the framework of Soviet laws. I strongly advocate strengthening conscious discipline at work and in everyday life, and consider that we could use, taking account of present conditions, comrades, the experience of 1983. [end recording] He is evidently referring to the measures taken at that time. Well, you remember that efforts we made to catch people who violated discipline in shops, bathhouses, and restaurants. Well, and that brings us to two more questions and answers.

[Begin recording] [Kachanov] Kachanov, Kuybyshev oblast organization. Yegor Kuzmich, despite the fact that you have touched on the matter in passing, we would like to have a specific answer to the following question: How far were you responsible for the decision that led to the events in Tbilisi? The point is that we have your testimony to the Sobchak commission, and also the stenographic record of the February plenum, where two opinions of the Politburo are represented—of a member of the Politburo, yours, and that of Shevardnadze. The first opinion asserts that there was a session of the Politburo under Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and the second, of Shevardnadze, that no such session took place. Rank-and-file communists get the impressiion that a session of the Politburo does not take 12 and 14 hours, but is sometimes held on the way from the gangway of a plane to a car.

[Niyazov] Well, there are members of the Politburo here, they are in the hall, and they can confirm once again what Ligachev said then, at the Congress of People's Deputies, and here in the hall. You can accuse Ligachev of anything you like, but it is impossible to impugn his honest and frankness. Third microphone.

[Lazarev] Lazarev, mandate [indistinct number] I have in my hand a stenographic report of the Russian inaugural congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR. Let me read from it: Session of 20 June. Speech of Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev: The government measures on the transition to the regulated market economy were discussed neither in the politburo, nor at the plenum of the Central Committee. Session of 21 June: speech of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev: Radical economic reform, its necessity and concept [as heard] were discussed at the June plenum of the party Central Committee, and therefore to consider that the idea came out of the blue is slander. Would you care to comment on the word slander. Thank you your answer.

[Ligachev] Very well. By the way, please pay attention and hear me out. Both are absolutely correct. [commotion in hall] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke of the concept which we had examined two years back, and all that is authentic. But Ligachev spoke of the specific measures the government had elaborated in accordance with that concept. This was submitted to the Supreme Soviet without any preliminary examination either in the Central Committee of the party or in the Politburo. [end recording]

The questions to Comrade Shevardnadze had to do in one way or another with events in Eastern Europe. Eduard Amvrosiyevich has more than once given his view on this problem, and he spoke about in his address at the plenum also. So, today he replied briefly to a number of notes. Here, for example, is his view of the issue of the destiny of the world socialist system.

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] This is a major issue, and a complex one, and to a considerable extent it is theoretical. Here we need a clear concept of the system. In our country the building of socialism was completed, that is how we understood it and interpreted it. Now we understand we still have a long way to go. It is more correct to say athat what has collapsed is not the system of socialism, but the system of distorted notions of socialism. There have been, and remain, socialist countries in the world, and they will develop. Of that I have no doubt. Delegate (?Unkayu) writes: On the basis of your assessment of the elimination of the world system of socialism, as a process of the abolition of the totalitarian regimes, do you believe, as a communist, in the historic prospect of the socialist path of development on the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism? I cannot agree with such an interpretation of what I said. But, I will try to answer the second part of the question. I certainly do believe in the socialist idea, the socialist path of development, on the basis of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. Freed from models which are alien to it and lead to an impasse, the socialist idea has an historic future. Delegate (?Kastuchenko) writes: Who is responsible for the collapse of the Warsaw bloc and of the socialist camp as a whole? What was your role in that process? The question has been put directly, and I will try to answer it with the same directness. A bloc that has to be held by force from collapse was not and cannot be a reliable support in a serious cause. Would it not be better for our own security to rely on an alliance based on common interests? I see my duty as building new relations with the neighboring allied countries and ensuring that these relations will be mutually beneficial, goodneighborly, and friendly, so that we may fruitfully cooperate and closely interact. [end recording]

Then, as I said, it was decided to stop the question-and-answer session. Before the break the delegates voted to give a personal assessment of the work, in the period under review, of each member of the Politburo. Incidentally, Comrade Yakovlev said that 90 percent of the work of the Politburo is on a collegial basis, and that one does not feel comfortable about ascribing to oneself either merit or the blame for errors in its work. Anyway, after reflection, the delegates did come to the conclusion that they should give a general assessment of the work of the leading bodies of the party Central Committee in the period under review. The congress discussed a resolution on the political report of the CPSU Central Committee.

More on Question Session

LD0707132590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0858 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, 7 Jul (TASS)—TASS correspondents Boris Zverev, Andrey Orlov, and Vladimir Isachenkov report from the Kremlin:

Members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, who delivered reports to the congress at the start of the week, are today answering delegates' questions. The first to come to the rostrum was Nikolay Ryzhkov, head of the Soviet government. Although under congress standing orders the Politburo members were due to answer only previously submitted written questions, Nikolay Ryzhkov after a brief introductory address suggested that questions be asked orally.

Speaking of his attitude to what Mikhail Gorbachev had said in the political report about it being absurd to begin the transition to a market economy with an increase of prices, Nikolay Ryzhkov stated that he had spoken with Mikhail Gorbachev on this matter and thinks that "there is some mistake here". "I also consider that it is absurd to begin the transition to a market only with an increase of prices", he stressed, noting that the program for a transition to market must be of an integrated character and not boil down to just an increase of prices.

The head of the Soviet government stated in particular that in connection with the acute shortage of fuel which is hampering the timely gathering in of the harvest a decision has been taken to remove 7 million tonnes of oil from exports, including those to the socialist countries. "This will make it possible to ensure provisions for agriculture", Nikolay Ryzhkov assured the delegates.

A question was also asked about the expediency of holding a referendum among the Lithuanian population on confidence in its leadership. In reply Nikolay Ryzhkov said that, if at the forthcoming talks the Lithuanian leaders insist on leaving the Soviet Union, it must take place "in strict accordance with the law on the procedure for the departure of a republic from the USSR from its first to last letter" and provide for the holding of a referendum. "However I think that...the inhabitants of Lithuania will hardly express themselves in favor of leaving the USSR. In our new concept for the building of a federal state there are many possibilities for finding a special status for this republic," Nikolay Ryzhkov stated.

After the interval delegates' questions will be answered by Vadim Medvedev and Aleksandr Yakovlev, members of the politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee.

Answering delegates' questions today Vadim Medvedev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the Central Committee ideological commission, stated that in all he had received 750 questions. In this respect, he noted, many delegates have been expressing the view that "all ideology in the party has been totally eliminated" and asking "what made it possible for ideological work in the party to disintegrate to such a level".

In the speaker's opinion, such an assessment of ideological work could lead one into a false position. In former times, Vadim Medvedev said, "when hypocrisy and lies, a stagnation of ideas, and dogmatism prevailed in ideology and when there was an enormous divergence with practice and a shameless limitation of glasnost, ideology was 'flourishing'". "Has ideology disintegrated" now, the speaker asked, "when we have been freeing ourselves from all that and have embarked on the path of renewal?"

He doubted the claims of a number of delegates that a single person could bring about the disintegation of ideology. At the same time, while admitting grave errors that have been made in this sphere, Vadim Medvedev rejected as a "stereotype of social awareness" the position that "the CPSU does not have an ideology of perestroyka". "Without in any way taking responsibility away from the ideological front," he said, "I consider that ideology, the theory of perestroyka and our ideas about humane democratic socialism can be forged only in the crucible of practical, revolutionary transforming activity. They can only be the fruit of collective efforts".

Many questions concerned the role of the mass media. In this respect, according to the speaker, "the spirit of the overwhelming number of notes and questions is that 'pressure be put' on the mass media." In his view "the working conditions of the Soviet press have been fundamentally changing and the methods of its management must be different. They must be based on the law...and they should, of course, rely on the party and civic conscience of the journalist".

Answering a question from delegates, Vadim Medvedev stated that the thought of retirement was ever present throughout the long period of his work in the Politburo, but he had been held back from taking this step by a "sense of responsibility for what is happening and the stability of the country's political leadership". "Now that the congress is opening up a fresh page in our development—a very complex and difficult page," he said, "I am not leaving the work but I consider that really there should also be younger, more energetic people and perhaps people with more drive".

Then Aleksandr Yakovlev, politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took the floor.

Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stated his intention to leave the party's political leadership.

The orator had to answer questions from a hall which was in a strongly electrified atmosphere. One of the delegates who "burst up" to the microphone even accused his counterparts of "submitting to Aleksandr Yakovlev's talent as an orator and accepting too warmly his report", which took place on the second day of the 28th congress work.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee admitted that the overwhelming majority of questions which he received were critical in character. In their notes and orally, delegates, who had a day before refused to examine the matter of the party responsibility of the "creators of stagnation", Grishin, Kunayev, Aliyev, and others, accused one of the acknowledged architects of perestroyka of "connivance at the separatism of the Baltic", blamed him for the "collapse of CEMA and the Warsaw Pact" and the "loss of Eastern Europe" and charged him with "duplicity and dishonesty".

Recalling his statements against separatism and nationalism, which he delivered during his visits to the Baltic republics, the speaker said that, in his opinion, the normalization of the situation in this region requires "restraint and responsibility from all sides, political dialogue, and also the quickest possible progress of perestroyka and a new union treaty. And the latest actions in Moscow and Vilnius are a step in the correct direction."

Aleksandr Yakovlev also agreed with the suggestion of critics that a deputies' commission should be set up to investigate his activity during his visit to the Baltic republics which would define the extent of his responsibility. At the same time, he noted that "the responsibility should be mutual" and, if the commission does not expose anything reprehensible, punishment should be borne by the initiators of the campaign directed against him.

Speaking of the processes that are occuring in Eastern Europe, Aleksandr Yakovlev said that "if the peoples turn away from the communist parties", this means that "the policy of these parties is not perceived by the peoples as their own, and here it is not just a matter of anti-socialist forces". "You cannot change life, the speaker said, and "you won't change the fact by decision of the Central Committee that in South Korea industrial production is 10 times higher than in North Korea and that the standard of living in West Germany is much higher that in East Germany."

As far as the question of a united Germany is concerned, in the words of the speaker, "it has been posed by life itself". The Central Committee secretary expressed the conviction that the "countdown has started of a peaceful period in the life of mankind, that the building of a civilization of a new type without wars and weapons is starting."

The morning session of the congress ended after the speech by Aleksandr Yakovlev. The forum of communists will continue its work this afternoon.

Lebedev Reviews 7 July Congress Proceedings

LD0707195290 Moscow TASS in English 1939 GMT 7 Jul 90

[by TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Reskov]

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS—The complexity of the situation, that took shape in the Soviet Union, consists in the fact that neither communists, nor society in general were prepared for such serious changes, said Aleksandr Lebedev, deputy head of the press centre of the 28th party congress. He spoke at a regular briefing today on the results of the sixth day of the forum of Soviet communists.

Judging by the reaction of some delegates, the atmosphere of rejection of the main provisions of perestroyka still remains. At the same time, Lebedev pointed out that one cannot fail to notice the disintegration of "some stereotype notions...the changing of philosophy."

Lebedev cited the results of a public opinion poll taken shortly before the opening of the congress, in which some 1,500 people from 18 regions took part. Twenty-eight per cent of the polled believe that the party congress will help overcome the crisis in Soviet society, 50 per cent expressed doubts over it and 22 per cent answered in the negative.

The greatest concern of 62 per cent of the polled is the worsening of the economic situation. Fifty-two per cent are especially concerned over crime, 52 per cent—over ecological problems, 46 per cent—over interethnic problems, 42 per cent—over the absence of social protection and 32 per cent—over the weakening of power in the country. Only nine per cent of the polled are concerned over international problems.

Fourteen per cent of the polled assessed the government programme of the transfer to a market-oriented system "in a comparatively positive way," while 58 per cent believe that "another way to it is possible, that would not involve the deterioration of the living standards of the population."

Forty one per cent believe that "private sector in a small volume is acceptable," 23 per cent favour the domination of the private sector and 15 per cent of the polled categorically oppose it.

Fifteen per cent of the polled favour the preservation of the Soviet Union in its present form, while 56 per cent support "full independence of republics, united by a new treaty."

Responding to the question what kind of a party the Soviet Communist Party should be, 36 per cent of the polled answered that it should be "a party of the consolidation of all sections of society that support the ideas of socialism." Twenty per cent believe that its should be a party of the working class and 20 per cent are of the opinion that it is "no longer necessary."

Fifty one per cent of the polled favour the depolitisation of the army and law enforcement agencies, 21 per cent oppose it and 20 per cent found it difficult to answer this question.

Information Report on 7 July Proceedings

PM0807150590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed "Information Report on the Course of the 28th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] The 28th CPSU Congress continued work in Moscow's Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 7 July 1990.

The morning session was chaired by S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet.

V.L. Yurchenkova, director of the Khoyniki No. 2 Secondary School in Gomel Oblast, addressed congress participants.

Then reports were heard from representatives of the sections working at the congress.

Reports were delivered by:

I.I. Melnikov, secretary of the party committee of the Lomonosov Moscow State University, on behalf of the "Party Renewal" section;

I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA, on behalf of the "Ideological Work" section;

S.I. Gurenko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, on behalf of the "Socioeconomic Policy" section:

V.A. Starodubtsev, chairman of the Lenin Collective Pedigree Stock Raising Farm in Tula Oblast and chairman of the USSR Peasants' Union, on behalf of the "CPSU Agrarian Policy" section;

V.A. Kuptsov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Department for Work With Sociopolitical Organizations, on behalf of the "Party, Soviets, and Sociopolitical Organizations and Movements" section;

A.N. Girenko, CPSU Central Committee secretary, on behalf of the "CPSU Nationalities Policy" section;

and V.M. Falin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, on behalf of the "CPSU International Activity" section.

At the end of the reports the congress adopted a decision on terminating the debates.

Then the following CPSU Central Committee Politburo members answered questions from congress participants: N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and V.A. Medvedev and A.N. Yakovlev, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee.

After the recess the sitting continued under M.S. Gorbachev's chairmanship.

The congress continued hearing answers from CPSU Central Committee Politburo members to questions put to them. Congress participants were addressed by Ye.K. Ligachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister.

In response to a proposal from a number of delegations the further hearing of replies to questions was completed at this point.

Then V.A. Ivashko, director of the Drafting Commission, reported to the congress on work on the draft Resolution of the 28th CPSU Congress on the Political Report of the party Central Committee and read it out.

After a preliminary exchange of opinions, the congress instructed the Drafting Commission to do further work on the document in the light of the comments and proposals made and submit it to the congress' delegates.

Ukraine To Recall Congress Deputies to Parliament

LD0707161690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1529 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, 7 Jul (TASS)—The Supreme Soviet of Ukraine has adopted an unprecedented decision, to call back deputies to the republican parliament from the 28th CPSU Congress, reports the IZVESTIYA newspaper from Kiev today. According to the paper, the question of their being recalled was conditioned by two facts—the first, the possible political strike by the miners and the second, the difficulties the republican Supreme Soviet has encountered in its discussion of the document on the sovereignty of the republic. The absence of a considerable number of deputies has in effect paralyzed the work of the Ukrainian parliament.

As the paper comments, the absence of a considerable number of communist parliamentarians who "left for the congress without the permission of the session" was considered by the opposition as "quite impermissible, particularly in conditions of political and social tension within the republic and as evidence that narrow party interests have been placed above the interests of the peoples of Ukraine." It was proposed to summon back immediately all members of the USSR Supreme Soviet who were delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress for work in the republican parliament.

After a brief discussion, the Supreme Soviet decided to call back to its session not only the parliamentarians from the congress but all deputies, without exception, wherever they might be. Two hundred and ninety-one deputies of the 317 present voted for the immediate recall of the members of parliament.

Kazakh President Gives News Conference

LD0707140190 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 7 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandras Budrys and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS—We favour the republic's sovereignty within the framework of the Soviet federation, Kazakhstan President Nursultan Nazarbayev, who is also republican Communist Party chief, told a news conference held by Kazakhstan's delegation at the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress today.

Kazakh communists' position at the congress is that "the Soviet Union should be preserved as a powerful world state."

"We are for the unity of the Soviet Communist Party, but also for the independence of the republic's communist party that could, within the framework of the common party rules, party membership cards and platform with the Soviet Communist Party, elaborate its own policy, platform and resolve cadre and structural problems, including direct relations with communist parties of other republics and foreign countries, which support Marxism-Leninism," Nazarbayev said.

Speaking of the higher party leadership, Nazarbayev said its main drawback was that "all these years people devoted to an old administer-by-command style of work remained around Mikhail Gorbachev."

He noted the need to reorganise the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo completely. If the Politburo heads a multinational party, it should include representatives of all republican communist parties, Nazarabayev said.

Nazarbayev criticised the Soviet Government and personally Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov for inconsistency and insufficient consideration of decisions taken and the absence of a strategic plan for economic restructuring of the country.

Ryzhkov is a highly competent and prepared leader, but his mistake is that he "remained adherent to ministries and departments and failed to reject their diktat," Nazarabayev said.

Asked about the Semipalatinsk test site in Kazakhstan, Nazarbayev said psychological influence of tests on the population, that gets no compensation, causes great social tension. Talks that are currently held with the Soviet leadership show that the closing of the test site is a matter of time, Nazarbayev said.

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Meet Workers 8 July

LD0807103190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0839 GMT 8 Jul 90

[Excerpt] [Announcer] We now have the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on the line. As we have already reported comrades Gorbachev and Ryzhkov are presently holding a meeting there with workers and peasants taking part in the 28th CPSU Congress. On the line we should have our correspondent...who is it?

[Korotkov] Yuriy Korotkov.

[Announcer] Ah, Yuriy Korotkov, fine. So it's correspondent Yuriy Korotkov, a member of our parliamentary team. Could you tell us what's happening?

[Korotkov] Yes, the meeting is being attended not only by worker and peasant delegates to the congress, but by guests as well. As you know, 350 workers and peasants have been invited to the congress. There's a short break at the moment, but the assembly has already been addressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov.

[Announcer] When did the meeting begin?

[Korotkov] At 1000 precisely. It will go on until lunchtime...

[Announcer] And when's that?

[Korotkov] At 1400. After that the commissions will be in session and Comrade Gorbachev will be taking part in one of them, and tomorrow the congress gets back to work.

In his speech, Comrade Gorbachev brought up six main problems—I have grouped them by subject. I could list them briefly to give you an idea...

[Announcer] Of course.

[Korotkov] First, attitudes toward the market among workers and peasants. It seemed to me that he considers the workers to be somewhat conservative in this respect—they don't want to switch to the market—and he tried to persuade them that it is essential to do so. We are not altering our ideology, he said, it is merely a tactic of switching to new life circumstances.

The second issue was the need to create a new Union treaty which crosses all the t's and dots the i's regarding the relationship between the center and the Union republics and oblasts.

The third problem was the peasant issue: i.e. granting the peasants complete independence and self-reliance.

The fourth was the housing problem. A new program is now being drawn up and finalized. You know that the Politburo's earlier program of providing each family with a separate flat by 1990 is not realistic because the scale, the horizons, are expanding.

[Announcer] How far back has that horizon moved now?

[Korotkov] That's a difficult issue, because the estimates have changed. In the past, for instance, each family...

[Announcer, interrupting] But did Mikhail Sergeyevich at least name a date for this?

[Korotkov] He said that even more housing must be built in the next five-year plan—900 million square meters. During the present five-year plan 550 million square meters of housing are to be built, but 900 million must be built in the next five-year plan. Quite how, I'm not sure. He quickly said that we are short of building materials, they are all being used for garden plots. So there are several paradoxes in my view...

[Announcer, interrupting] Do you mean that people are better off living on their garden plots than in flats?

[Korotkov] Well there is a point here, because personal property is evidently having some effect on all these things.

Next, the role of the local soviets was discussed and the relationship between them and the party. There was an interesting nuance here too—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that the party had lost in the elections of people's deputies to the Supreme Soviet, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, and the local bodies and that this—as he put it—was our mistake, one that had to be taken into account in the future so that the party could win a worthy position as well. The sixth point was attitudes toward the top party leadership, in particular, the Politburo. You know what kind of debate went on yesterday, it was a very animated day—I was present myself. In fact, one could say that the Politburo members were saved from attack, having to account for their actions to the delegates.

[Announcer] But why should they be saved?

[Korotkov] To stop personal assessments being given and prevent sham trials [word indistinct] 1937.

[Announcer] I understand, but what does...what do you mean 1937? In 1937 they arrested people, but all we're talking about now is elementary responsibility of each for his own work and that's that.

[Korotkov] Well, I don't know, perhaps my guests here could tell you. I have beside me now some workers who are taking part in the meeting: Khachatur Meloyan, a fitter from Yerevan tire works and secretary of the party primary organization, and Vyacheslav Smirnov, an electric crane operator from the Podolsk reinforced concrete structures works and secretary of the works' party bureau. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA Report

PM0907124590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by A. Ilin: "Meeting in Kremlin with Congress Delegate Workers and Collective Farm Members"]

[Text] The discussion at this meeting in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses began, it may be said, even before its official opening. One after another, congress delegates mounted the rostrum to take the microphone and deliver a brief appeal to their comrades. The point of the appeals was how to ensure that the meeting of worker and peasant delegates is as effective as possible, does not focus on details or trivia as has sometimes happened, and does not develop into a confrontation between the "grass roots" and the "those at the top" but helps to make the congress' work more precise and to clarify positions of principle.

What are the main questions troubling the participants in the discussion? One of the delegates put it like this: The role of the working class and the peasantry and the strengthening of the CPSU's ties with the workers' movement. Why is an impression being formed that workers and peasants are being ousted from political life, and how is the situation to be remedied? Delegates were also interested in problems of the radical economic reform, the switch to the market, and the possible changes in working people's lives connected with that.

You have brought here to the congress, M.S. Gorbachev noted in his opening address, moods characteristic of the atmosphere in our society. The very great concern and tension are due primarily to the situation in the economy. Here, too, is the source of the criticism aimed at our party. If the socioeconomic difficulties are successfully overcome, tension in society will also largely be removed. Therefore, these are the questions that Communists and party organizations should consider first of all.

After a lively debate on the best way to structure the meeting, the sides agreed on the following format: Listen to M.S. Gorbachev's and N.I. Ryzhkov's answers to delegates' questions and then exchange opinions. And the questions were most varied. How to resolve the food problem more successfully? How to advance the economic reforms more quickly and, most important, with greatest effect? Does the switch to the market not mean a move toward capitalism? What should the attitude toward private ownership be?...

These questions may seem somewhat naive to experienced economists. But—and this was clearly stated at the meeting—the economic reform will make confident progress and be productive only when its sense, aims, forms, and methods are understood and appreciated by every working man and if he works conscientiously. And undoubtedly he must be confident that the reform is being implemented in the interests of workers and the people.

The meeting also broached problems of elaborating the new Union Treaty aimed at protecting the country and society from disorder and the rush into ethnic compartmentalization, and at promoting fruitful cooperation among our country's peoples. M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov described new approaches to the solution of the housing question and the opportunities for increasing housing construction by making more active use of credits and the population's own resources.

One of today's paramount problems is that of mutual relations between the party and the soviets and the representation of workers and peasants in organs of power. Participants in the meeting discussed various approaches to the solution of this task and noted the need for party committees to act more energetically and strengthen ties with people. It is necessary to take a new approach to the workers movement, it was said at the meeting, to help it, and to establish close cooperation with workers organizations and trade unions.

Much attention was paid to ensuring the priorities in the development of agriculture and to creating and developing the social sphere in the countryside.

Participants in the meeting constantly returned to the course of the 28th CPSU Congress and in particular to the reports delivered in the last few days by members and candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and CPSU Central Committee secretaries. Various viewpoints were expressed, and keen and sometimes hostile questions were asked. At the same time, those present greeted with understanding the explanation that despite the individual mistakes that have been made, the constructive work of the Central Committee and its Politburo on implementing the strategic course of perestroyka should be noted.

In the recess the delegates continued putting questions to M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov face to face without the aid of microphones. There were also lively conversations with Ye.K. Ligachev, Yu.D. Maslyukov, and members of the government taking part in the meeting. Everyone wanted to get information from the horse's mouth, as it were.

These brief notes cannot list all the questions, of course—both the global questions, so to speak, affecting the fate of the party and the country, and the specific questions relating to individual details, people, or speakers at the congress. But, I think, one may note the undoubted positive outcome of this and other meetings with different categories of delegates held during the congress' work—they have made it possible to clarify positions and take a step toward one another in understanding the complexity of the situation and in seeking ways out of the crisis through the renewal of the party and its democratization.

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Interviewed

LD0807190790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1625 GMT 8 Jul 90

[Interview with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by correspondent Sergey Slipchenko after a meeting with workers and peasants participating in the 28th CPSU Congress in Moscow; from the "Topical Interview" program—recorded]

[Text] [Slipchenko] The workers, delegates to the party congress, have been adopting several appeals to the working class of the country, to the workers who are preparing a so-called warning strike on the 11th. Today, after your meeting with the workers, an attempt was also made to adopt an appeal to the congress and evidently it will be adopted. How can it happen that the working class, workers, are sitting in the hall appealing to workers outside the hall, and there the workers are not listening to these calls, these appeals, anymore and are continuing to pursue their line regardless, putting forward demands for purely political strikes? How can one make sense of these actions? It looks as if there are workers there and workers here but there is no unity among the working class.

[Gorbachev] I think that of course to some extent this reflects the situation in the country, because at the congress as well I would not say that everyone was speaking in the same voice and from the same position. At the congress different approaches are present, with different appraisals and sometimes they are very acute, sometimes diametrically opposed. Nevertheless, there is one thing in common: At the congress there is a realization of the fact that the country now needs agreement, consolidation. Therefore amid all the passion I can nevertheless see that the congress is taking extreme care to see things do not result in a split but in strengthening and that the voice that is heard in the country from the documents may be such that the party may perform as an active force, uniting people.

I think it should not be said that these demands are the demands of all the coal miners. They are no doubt the demands of certain collectives. The attitude I would take toward these ultimata would be to tell our coal miners, our guardsmen of the army of labor, to be guardsmen again and to understand and to listen to the country. There are other appeals, but if they listen to the people and the opinion here at the congress—and the whole country is represented here—there is [changes thought] everyone should realize that this is not the time for ultimata. It is the time for practical work. This applies to the president, the government. It applies to all the authorities and it applies to all the labor collectives.

Comrades, we can work only for as long as you trust us. If there is no trust, one has to get people who are trusted. In the case in question, I have to say that someone wants to stir up the workers. At a time when we have reached a stage of real deeds this is the road to ruin. Who is acting then, who is doing this, responsible people, at such a time when, after the Supreme Soviet, after the discussion in the Presidential Council, when all of society and now the congress are discussing all these questions and proposals, sharp, critical ones? Who, at such a time is contributing and acting in this way? I think someone is pushing the miners and the working class and our people onto the wrong path. I state this resolutely.

[Slipchenko] But the now well-known Resolution 608, according to which the government promised to do a lot and to fulfill many demands, economic demands, provides the grounds, and this Resolution is not now being implemented to the degree which was promised to regions of the country?

[Ryzhkov] Well, I have the impression that the meeting with the workers and peasants that has just ended, and indeed the past days of the congress's work show the situation in the economy now really is acute and complex. The main thing is that in our country, more than one problem has risen to the surface. If only we had just one economic problem of some kind in the country, we would deal with it very quickly. Today, however, there are also the problems of the miners. Today there are the problems of the machinebuilders, metallurgists, chemical workers, and just look how many problems there are in the agro-industrial complex of the country.

In other words, in the field of culture, health, education in our country, there is a great deal, there are now very many problems that have to be tackled. For this reason I also think today's meeting—a very sharp one, and at the same time very constructive—will allow us to work out our measures and steps that will make it possible to tackle these problems step by step.

You are asking a specific question on Resolution 608. Yes, last year, when the strike movement flared up in the country, over ten days the government very attentively considered all their requests and this resolution came into being very quickly and I do not think it embraced all the problems of the miners' problem that need solving, but the main thing, the main thing nevertheless is that it took in the issues of social, economic, and industrial life. For this reason, in the course of a year I can say we adopted, well, perhaps the most urgent measures—I would even say active measures—to implement this resolution.

It is a different matter that not everything was taken into account, not everything. Evidently there will still be problems. There are very many of them. But look at the question, say, of the pensions. After all, it has been resolved as written in Decision 608, or that from the first of the month the decision on granting additional leave-days came into effect. The questions of pay have been... that is, have been resolved to a large extent. That is, a great many questions in Resolution 608 are being resolved, but there a number of aspects that require a slightly longer time.

For example, we have adopted a governmental decision on the social development of the Kuzbass, let us say, of Kazakhstan, and of the north, of Vorkuta. So, we are hoping we will definitively make a decision on the social developent of the Donbass, Vorshilograd Oblast, Donetsk Oblast, and other regions next week. That is, we concern ourselves with these issues all the time because we have understood and we really have acknowledged this past year that those social problems, as it were, which have accumulated over many years, exist among the miners.

The government has, for this reason, been very attentive in its attitude toward this. I cannot say that it is being fully carried out, let us suppose, with such issues as material and technical supply. Today the issue of the supply of timber is acute, for pit props and so on. True, work has not been completed here. Some kind of urgent measures need to be taken here for these problems to be solved. For this reason I think now when we have gotten into such a situation in the country where we really need to consolidate, then to unite efforts, to resolve these issues—the miners also need to understand this—that what is still holding together to some extent, what is regulated and directed toward resolving tasks, including miners' tasks, must not be destroyed today, now. For this reason, today, understanding everything, all of the problems facing the miners, it is at the same time necessary to appeal and I am simply making the exhortation that now is not the time to engage in such ultimata. On the contrary, it is necessary to concentrate the full attention of both the government and all labor collectives on solving the problems the country faces.

[Slipchenko] That is, you wish to say the government and the president and general secretary, you cannot live from strike to strike: the coal workers go on strike, these problems have to be solved; the metal workers go on strike, one needs to rush in that direction. These are not solutions.

[Gorbachev] I would like the comrades standing next to me to continue our conversation on this question. Usually, in the good old times, it was said often that the workers were alongside. You should ask this question and let them answer.

[Slipchenko] The president of the country, the party general secretary, the head of the government, workers and delegates of the party congress, do you really not, all together, consider that some kind of third real force exists that wishes to break the processes now moving?

[Klaipeda driver] Such a force exists. I, as an ordinary communist, a worker, a driver frm the Klaipeda maritime trade port, would like to name it. I wanted to speak, but just did not manage. This force is very well organized in the country; it has crossed spheres, that is, too many spheres, and it has a very active influence on the whole environment and it has understood who could repulse it. People's Control and Workers' Control may repulse this force. And this People's Control is now disappearing, as it were, attempts are being made to weaken its influence in the country. For this reason, all the same, they sense who might oppose this force. For this reason, they are trying to get rid of it, the People's Control. This force is straining for power and it is already having real results because all of the shortages in the country are in my view being artificially maintained. It is advantageous to maintain them. Colossal amounts of money are earned from these shortages; this money does not go into the state's pockets but into the pockets of those fores that now want this money to later embody it in their power and restore... [changes thought] I am from the Baltics, this is close to us, we have already gone through all of this, and for this reason these are not simply words, I have experienced this in my fate, so to speak. This is very close to me now. The choice has now presented itself of where I am to live. Either in the Soviet Union or in an, as it were, bourgeois republic? For me it is simple, I am a citizen of the Soviet Union, I can understand things only in this way.

[G.E. Koltsov] So I would like to put it like this: to take a rest, as it were. Imagine for a moment the general secretary has listened to us and come to an agreement with Bush: Listen, save us! On America's 500th anniversary, he loads us all onto ships, planes and boats and ships us all off to the United States. Waiting for us there are roads, cars, computers, cottages, sausages, everything. Bush sails over here. With our competence, with our skill and our technical knowledge, what sufficiency we would have in the United States! Everything there is already prepared for us, and we have sailed and arrived there. In a year we have (?turned it inside out), in a year and a half we will be at each other's throats, and then we cry to heaven, mother, give us the next America! So, what is the reason?

I have listened more than once to our head of state. He says, whichever way you turn, there are masses of problems, whichever say you turn, masses of problems. Even those who are in branches of industry that are doing well are shouting. Yet, if you lift the edges of all these problems and look, what is under them? The answer is in four words: The abysmal quality of soviet schooling. We turn out bad pupils. We (?are producing substandard) students. Our engineers are no good. Even the ministers are lame ducks.

Who will tell me: we have got to learn to trade. One comes and another and they come to agreement. But who knows how to trade, strike a bargain? Where is the gold reserve of our ideas? Surely those were not bad groups and delegates who came here formerly? But where is all that they offered? If you leaf through the album, this question has already been raised here perhaps 200 times. Why must I, 200 times, be the first? [sentence as heard] But the system of analysis and of drawing general conclusions on these problems! There should be a catalogue. I would like to take home not an album of what I said to him, but an album, a catalogue, of ideas.

[Gorbachev] This is the best moment for me to come in. So that we may both work differently and get results, so that we may start taking an interest in the land, in our enterprise, in our republic, and in the joint strengthening and developing of all that capital we used to call friendship among people—and this country was born and took shape as a national country—for this we must continue perestroyka. It has now reached a stage and is now trying...[changes thought] Some are grabbing it by the legs and by everything and trying to hold it back and prolong their position a bit longer, because the changes that are going to happen in the future, in the economy too, will move a great many things apart. They open the way for people with talent and initiative, who can do the job and will immediately get rid of those who are incapable of working. Sometimes he has been sitting there for years and producing nothing. This does not only apply to the management cadres; I would even say not as much.

This topic has been rightly raised. We must, through new incentives, through new forms of economic life, by removing state control, through leasehold, through contract—and I will not enumerate all the things we are talking about at this time—we must unfetter the initiative of the individual. Let the active man work, others will be drawn in, and let the idler not enjoy the fruits. We have, you know, a very great many who specialize in taking their share, but we ourselves occupy very little either with incentives or with standards of work.

[Slipchenko] The question is often asked: Can the party regard itself as a vanguard party when the working class is leaving the party and young people are not joining this party of the future?

[Gorbachev] You know, what you said about the working class leaving and young people not joining, well I would not accept that as coming to the same thing, as a view wholly reflecting the situation. It is true that both things are happening. But you see, they...the meeting with invited workers delegates has only just ended, and you know, the fate of the party is very dear to them. I feel that. They want to...they asked us why it has turned out that over the years of perestroyka and democratization, when the working man features as the main figure at the center of the policy, how was the party able to allow the positions of the working class to be to some extent weakened in the soviets and in other governing bodies? How could the party do that? That is the complaint they have lodged and I think the complaint is correct. For this reason the party, if it does not have ties to the working class, if it does not have —there's no getting away from it—if it is not supported, if it fails to gather to itself the best forces of the working class, then the party is dead. It has no prospects. This was a central issue in our discussion, in addition to particular issues.

[Slipchenko] Who depends on whom here: the party on the working class, or the working class on the party?

[Gorbachev] You know, the primary resource of our party—a party of the working class, a party with a workers' ideology—is still the working class itself. It is for the party, but for a renewed party. I can already see that and feel it, because there is a sense at the bottom that the processes of renewal are proceeding slowly, including at the center. It is for this reason that at the congress now such strong demands are being made of the Central Committee, of members of the Politburo, of the general secretary.

[Ryzhkov] In my view the working class...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Yes.

[Ryzhkov] ... needs defending at the moment. Here is the paradox. This is a party of the working class, yet in the situation now I think the working class actually needs defending. Just look how few of them there are in local bodies, in the soviets, in the Supreme Soviet, at the congresses.

[Gorbachev] I told the communist worker comrades today that the party is to blame before the working class...

[Ryzhkov, interrupting] Yes, and I am convinced...

[Gorbachev]... because things have worked out that way.

[Ryzhkov] I am convinced that precisely... yes ...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Conclusions will be drawn, I believe, and the working class will feel that the party is turning toward it in a real way. I think the party too will feel this, that it needs this and will sense support. We are already sensing it.

[Slipchenko] Perhaps it can be taken as a signal, these warning strikes, a signal that the changes are proceeding slowly and renewal of the party is proceeding slowly.

[Gorbachev] I do not exclude this. I just think again this is an extreme means, an extreme means of acting, if you like, and this is happening in a situation where we are on the threshold of profound, fundamental changes. It is too great a luxury, when we have become involved in such profound changes, to get involved again in a situation of conflict.

[Ryzhkov] This is intolerable right now. If a very big conflict were to arise in the country—the miners, and then other branches of the national economy might follow them—we will find ourselves faced with an unpredicatable situation. Can we really do this today? So what we need now is self-possession; we need wisdom, and wisdom of the miners is needed. What we have to do today, on the contrary, is be cohesive, to tackle all these problems, including the miners' problems.

[T.K. Pupkevich, identified by screen caption] I would like to say a few words about the congress of miners. There is talk that the miners' congress should be very thoroughly analyzed, that its composition should be looked at, its documents should be looked at, and that what kind of resolution was adopted there should be looked at, and why 100 people who are not miners at all traveled there from Moscow and what their relationship and ties with the miners are. Then this should be very thoroughly and conscientiously set out after hearing the opinions of the chairmen of the councils of labor collectives at workers' meetings, at the mines.

Excuse me, but I find it very hard to understand—I am a miner, operator of a walking excavator, and I am very familiar with many of the strike committees, because I have participated in them—I, for example, often find it very hard to understand why people appear there who have no connection with the miners and suddenly they...a congress takes place with them in the producers' chair.

[Gorbachev] We—both the government and I—are accused of having shuddered in the face of the miners last year, having made concessions. Now they are always intimidating us and pressuring us. I believe we acted correctly last year, because you know, you could not fail to respond to what was reported home by the comrades from the Politburo and from the commissions that traveled there and visited all the miners' towns, and saw how they really live, the facilities, or rather lack of facilities, and whatever the difficulties, we had to find the funds, and I spoke in favor then and supported the government. Whatever the difficulties, we had to find this, it was three or four billion.

[Ryzhkov] This year, implementing this well known Resolution 608, and despite the way our financial resources in our country are stretched, we have allocated 30 percent more funds to the social sphere of all the miners' settlements and towns than in past years, and overall, in 1990 alone we are allocating an extra R2 billion on the problem of Resolution 608—an extra R2 billion. We estimate it at 3 billion for next year. So, I think we acted correctly that year, correctly; we had been tremendously neglectful and we had to get it sorted out, and we had great understanding for the existing concerns.

[Gorbachev] Although we said plainly then, what, do the metallurgists have fewer problems? Do the chemicals workers have fewer? What if we cannot put up something for them too? The ...[hesitates] peasants in the countryside? What about the railways? If we carry on like this now, how will it end up?

[Unidentified man, off camera] If there are to be strikes now you will not be able to find those billions. They simply will not be there.

[Pupkevich] I have one question for you [word indistinct] mass information, look at this one thing: the miners' demands for resignation of the government. As a member of the Supreme Soviet, I have already participated when talks were held with the strikers (?at the top level). What does Resolution 608 mean? If today we dismiss—I would like to say it to our miners, to the working class, the working class cadres, so that they should always think, first and foremost—so, if we dismiss the government, who is going to implement Resolution 608? It would be good if they clarified that. The government leaving office will tell the incoming one it does not want to know anything about it, along with all the things won by the workers' movement in the strike committees. That means it will be (?buried) and go against the workers' movement in fact.

[Ryzhkov] You know, it is difficult for me to say anything at the moment because they make the resignation of the government their first point and I simply do not wish to defend myself here. But there is something else I do not understand. For all the scale of the problems in the union, in the agro-industrial complex, I have already repeated this, they are not posing the question of resignation of the government there. Two days ago Mikhail Sergeyevich and I met agriculturalists, there were 600 or 700 of them, and the conversation was very sharp, but they did not once bring up a question of the government resigning. On the contrary, they were saying: Let us find solutions. How can we find the way out? What can we do? That is what happens in any of the industries. With the miners, who we have been working with closely for a year, and I will say, well, one cannot say that everything has been done, but very much has been done, and now these collectives are saying things like down with the government, which adopted a resolution that tackles the issues! In general it is a paradox.

[Gorbachev] So someone needs this, but the coal miners must work it out. We perceive the miners' difficulties and problems but we realize the coal miners want to get it across to us that obviously perestroyka is not going as one would want it to in this industry, as well as others. Because when I said something today about the coal miners still not having yet obtained autonomy, that the question of these power industries having the possibility of working confidently and receiving profit and acting and tackling their own problems, that this question had not yet found a solution, it was all true. No doubt they want to send us a signal that perestroyka must be advanced more quickly. We are receiving this signal, but to act by such methods as the miners are now being encouraged to do by someone who is pushing them, is impermissible.

[Ryzhkov] There are many problems. The miners have many problems, but they must be tackled in the prescribed way. If we now take that road, the coal miners' problems will not be solved nor will other problems in the country be solved.

[Gorbachev] I hope the coal miner comrades will hear us and everything we are saying. I know it is as the coal miners might say things, blunt. I hope they too will receive with understanding what we are saying bluntly and at last from this dialogue that is going on at a distance, I think, understanding will emerge. The coal miners' position is not a matter of indifference to us. On the contrary, we appreciate it, but we want it to be a responsible one, especially now.

[Slipchenko] Thank you very much, Nikolay Ivanovich. Thank you, Mikhail Sergeyevich. Thank you.

Yakovlev Meets Democratic Movement Representatives

LD0807163990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 8 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] As you know, previously the president met the first secretaries of party organizations.

Aleksandr Yakovlev, secretary of the Central Committee, met congress delegates who are representatives of the democratic movement in the party. [passage omitted]

Information Report on 8 July Proceedings

PM0907115190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

["Information Report on the course of the 28th CPSU congress"]

[Text] The 28th CPSU Congress continued work in Moscow 8 July 1990. It took place outside the framework of plenary sittings.

M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov held a meeting in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses with workers and collective farm members who are delegates to the 28th party congress.

During the meeting there was a lively exchange of opinions on problems of the country's socioeconomic development, the CPSU's place and role in society, interethnic relations, and the state of public order and discipline. M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov gave detailed answers to the many questions from congress participants.

In accordance with the congress instruction, the Editorial Commission resumed work on the draft Resolution on the Party Central Committee's Political Report.

Commissions Meet on Rules, Draft Statement 8 Jul

LD0807200190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As you know, the 28th CPSU Congress has formed working commissions and many of them were working today:

[N. Shakhova] The commission for the CPSU draft rules is headed by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov. Today we witnessed very painstaking work on the part of all members of this collegiate body. Moreover, communists came to this session—which lasted almost six hours—who were not members of this commission but represented various platforms and they submitted their proposals. Among the numerous and various shortages raging in our society today is one that does not have any tangible material outlines, yet it is making itself felt increasingly acutely with the passage of time in people's moods and outlooks. Let us describe it as a shortage of certainty, precise knowledge about where we are and where we are going. And so, the commission for the draft program statement 'Toward Humane and Democratic Socialism' is working.

We have seen just a small fragment of the commission's work. There are many additions, proposals, and some remarks:

[Begin recording] [A.S.Kapto, head of the ideological department of the CPSU Central Committee] A number of new points are appearing. Well, for example, there wasn't a separate point on culture. Taking account of the discussions at the congress, at the plenary session, at the sectional sessions, we felt that such a point was required separately. I believe that it will be very well received by communists and all the public. But I wish to say that the discussion is taking place very constructively: it is very committed and there is the maximum degree of consideration for all points of view although, of course, a crystallization of the truth also presupposes that individual wishes, so to speak, cannot be taken into account.

[Shakhova] You will submit this program statement for a final judgement on Monday, is that not so?

[Kapto] Yes. I believe that most of the work will be completed today. But speaking frankly, I personally expect that many remarks and wishes will also be expressed afterwards at the plenary session. Therefore there is a great deal of work ahead. [end recording]

Press Conference Reviews Week's Sessions

LD0807164890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 8 Jul 90

[Statement by A.A. Lebedev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, at a news conference; presented by Yakov Smirnov, from the program entitled: "The Congress—the First Week's Work"; date, place not given—recorded]

[Text] Comrade Polozkov was in the chair for the morning session. The first report to be heard was on the work of comrade Pugo, chairman of the Party Control Commission and candidate member of the Central Committee Politburo. His work was characterized by the same shortcomings as the central organs of the party. The party Control Commission often interfered in the economy, in culture, and on occasion, as he put it, even in private life. Special attention was devoted in the work of the commission to restoring the good name of those members of the party who were unjustly condemned.

A report then was delivered by Comrade Manayenkov on his work in his post in the Central Committee Secretariat. He admitted that he recognises his responsibility for errors committed by the central organs of the party in the recent period, but he also pointed out that he was elected secretary of the Central Committee only in September of last year. He was responsible for coordinating the activity of kray and oblast party organizations in the Russian Buro of the Central Committee, but as he put it, he had not succeeded in doing anything positive in this post, as the work of the Russian Buro was, in essence, a fiction. The majority of his plans, as he put it, remained unfulfilled.

There was then, from my point of view, a very interesting address by Colonel General Volkogonov. He is now director of the Institute of Military History. It is clear today to all sensible party members, General Volkogonov said, that communist ideals will remain in the history of world thought as a wonderful utopia. He even made a reference to the fact that the general secretary of the party himself, Comrade Gorbachev, had been unable to define the long-term communist outlook. Volkogonov made the following appeal to those taking part in the section: Would it not be better to occupy ourselves with the shorter term, to be more exact, with socialism? I have a more or less precise quotation of what he said: The collapse of the ideas of totalitarian socialism does not at all mean that socialism has no historical chances. They exist, but if the party acts as it has previously, then it risks degenerating into a sectarian party.

Congress Resumes Work 9 July

LD0907072290 Moscow TASS in English 0718 GMT 9 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS—Delegates to the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress, which began in Moscow July 2, reconvened in the Kremlin today to continue discussing a package of crucial documents, after a one day break.

The package includes draft programme resolutions of the congress, new CPSU rules and several resolutions on party politics.

Early today the delegates approved a draft resolution on the political report by the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee. They will vote on its final text later.

Since the delegates have agreed to complete work within ten days, they will have to pass documents and elect ruling bodies within the remaining four days.

Gorbachev Ahead in Poll

LD0907095490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 9 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The 28th CPSU Congress will continue its work today in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. There has been a week of stormy debates. The congress sociological service provides information which summarizes to a certain extent: 41 percent of those polled fully support perestroyka, and only 14 percent think that perestroyka has caused the existing difficulties. More than half of those taking part in the congress support the proposition that the party will not interfere in the functions of soviet organs.

The election of a party leader is due shortly. According to the results of the poll, the highest rating—this is on 6 July—belongs to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

Kryuchkov Answers Delegates' Questions

LD0907123690 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 9 Jul 90

[Text] Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the Committee for State Security, today answered questions put to him by delegates at the [CPSU] congress. He said the organization he heads struggles against organized crime which is now widespread in the country.

He then spoke in detail about the case of a former general of the Committee for State Security, Oleg Kalugin, who made statements in the mass media discrediting the committee. Later Kalugin was stripped of his general's rank and all government decorations. Replying to a question about whether this was too severe a punishment, Kryuchkov said that in other countries the reaction would have been even tougher to disclosing professional secrets and methods of conducting intelligence work.

Describing the personal qualities of Kalugin, Vladimir Kryuchkov said that in 1987 he suggested that the Committee for State Security should check the political loyalty of everyone who is promoted to high office. Actually, that would have been a return to Stalin's methods of the thirties.

Answering another question, Kryuchkov said the Committee for State Security does not now collect information about public organizations. Its attention is focused only on people who are suspected of conducting anticonstitutional activity.

Profiles KGB General Kalugin

LD0907122490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1131 GMT 9 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, 9 Jul (TASS)—TASS correspondents Boris Zverev and Yuriy Sizov report from the Kremlin:

Replying to questions from delegates at the 28th CPSU Congress today, KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov dwelt in detail on the personality of Oleg Kalugin, former general of the state security bodies.

He stated that Kalugin was admitted to the KGB bodies in 1952 "with the help of his father" a regular officer of the NKVD (abbreviation for the then Ministry of Internal Affairs). Kalugin's career took off in the 70's, continued Vladimr Kryuchkov. In 1973 he became head of external counter-intelligence and was promoted to the rank of general.

According to the KGB leader, "Kalugin made no critical remarks at all against the KGB bodies or the political system while he was climbing the professional ladder."

Things deteriorated in 1979 when the KGB leadership was obliged to take the decision that it was impossible for him to continue his work in intelligence. Despite the delicate nature of the subject, Vladimir Kryuchkov explained to the delegates that "as a result of incompetent actions and direct violations of discipline" by Kalugin, a valuable source of information was lost.

Following this incident Kalugin was transferred to the Leningrad territorial department of the KGB, but unfortunately, Kryuchkov said, "an unhealthy situation evolved in that collective too, and he had to be transferred to Moscow and then dismissed into retirement on reaching the age of 55."

Vladimir Kryuchkov stated that Kalugin had "attempted to bargain with the KGB leadership," threatening to talk to the press. "We made no deals with our conscience," the speaker said "and Kalugin soon began to carry out his threats."

The KGB leader did not deny that there are shortcomings in the work of his department. He noted self-critically that "we have our failures and even fiascos." There are also serious mistakes in recruitment, he said, announcing that "over the past 11 years there have been eight cases of KGB officials defecting to the West and not 20, as Kalugin claims". Pointing to the high degree of responsibility borne by the intellegence and counter intelligence bodies, he announced for the first time that another foreign intelligence agent was arrested in the USSR around three weeks ago and that an investigation is under way.

Asked by delegates whether they had not treated the retired general too harshly in stripping him of his titles and awards, Vladimir Kryuchkov recalled that "Kalugin held a number of top posts and signed an undertaking not to divulge secrets." "He was perfectly aware that the forms and methods and specific areas of work of the KGB must not be divulged," Kyruchkov emphasized.

To Broadcast Proceedings 'In Full'

LD0907103190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 9 Jul 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer Yuriy Grigoryev] I am Yuriy Grigoryev. We are beginning with a live report from our all-Union radio correspondent in the Kremlin. Lyudmila Semina is on the line through the Ostankina studio:

[Semina] Today the congress is being chaired by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. The first issue was the decision on the CPSU Central Committee's report. [passage omitted] Then, just like on Saturday diametrically opposed assessments of the activities of the Central Committee, the Politburo, and the party emerged during a brief debate conducted in the congress hall. Reactions ranged from dissatisfaction right up to complete rejection of the way the party is operating. There were other views, too. For example, Kraykov, from the Chelyabinsk party organization, believes that the policy aimed at the perestroyka of the party must be endorsed. He also said that there is no need here to lynch the leadership. One should bear in mind the concepts of party comradeship, and work together.

Sharp words were said today about the mass information media whose work is said to be aimed at reducing the party's prestige.

[Grigoryev] Isn't this the organ in which you and I work?

[Semina] Yes. Bewilderment was also expressed in connection with the fact that there had not been any broadcast of the answers that the Politburo members gave to the deputies.

A decision has been adopted to broadcast the congress proceedings in full. I do not know whether full relays would add any prestige to some communists, since rude attacks and impolite utterances are continuing at the congress. David Kugultinov was forced once again to call the deputies to behave patiently and politely at the congress. Then, a report-back was delivered by the Central Auditing Commission. The floor was given to (Alla Afanasyevna Nizovtseva). The report-back was presented in a question and answer form. The questions varied: on the salary of Politburo members and where they receive it, on the source of resources used to maintain the Lenin Museum. And today at last, the delegates received an answer to a question that had been raised back at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress: Who pays the delegates' salaries during their work at the congress? The answer is that they are paid by their enterprises. This is a sign of rapprochement between the party and the state apparatus. Where a new form of organization of labor, such as financial autonomy and leasing, are established delegates are paid from the party budget already.

How much is being spent on the needs of party veterans? Here is a figure that was mentioned: in 1989 5.5 million was paid out.

Question: Is it not high time that pensioners' contributions should be made purely symbolic. The answer: Many party veterans believe it to be a matter of honor to make reasonable contributions to the party's budget. But generally, this issue can be resolved by each primary party organization at its own discretion and they should be given this opportunity.

The congress has ratified the report of the Central Auditing Commission. Then Comrade Kruchina, manager of the party Central Committee's affairs, delivered a report on the budget and party property. That was very interesting. I will be able to tell you the detail in an hour. With this I am now concluding my report from the Kremlin.

Morning Session Reviewed

LD0907105190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0830 GMT on 9 July carries a 17-minute report by correspondent Novitskaya on the 9 July morning session of the CPSU Congress proceedings.

Novitskaya reports that the congress session, chaired by Ryzhkov, discussed the party's report. Remarks on it are to be worked on by Ivashko and presented again for discussion after lunch. She says that the discussion dealt not so much with the constructive parts of the report, but with looking for someone to blame. She then says:

"As on Saturday, everyone concentrated not on constructive proposals, not on answers to the questions of what is to be done, but on answers to another of our eternal questions: Who is guilty?" She plays the following recording of an unidentified delegate:

"Please listen to a telegram sent to me from my constituency, Constituency 37, Prokopyevsk, Kemerovo Oblast. We consider it inadmissible that the post of general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and president of the country should be combined. Secondly, to show no-confidence in the Central Committee of the CPSU and its activity (?which expresses itself) in the slow rates of carrying out perestroyka processes in the party itself and in society as a whole. [signed] the secretaries of four party organisations of mines (?and) Number 3 Construction directorate. In addition please note the decision of the oblast party conference at which there was a clear call to express no-confidence in the Central Committee and the Politburo as a whole."

A delegate from Krasnodar criticizes Sobchak for saying on television that all the vines there had been cut down. Novitskaya says: "A quarrel broke out about the coverage of the congress. Most of the delegates feel that the congress is being covered in a tendentious and one-sided way by the mass media which is contributing to a decline in the prestige of the party [words indistinct], and although Kravchenko, the chairman of the commission on congress coverage, reminded them that the commission is not empowered to give orders to the mass media but only gives recommendations on coverage of the Congress, the argument continued and it was proposed that the former decision of the congress should be rescinded and full broadcasting be demanded. I don't know how the issue will be resolved, but in any case the delegates voted for full broadcasting of the congress. Consultations are now underway on the question."

Novitskaya then presents a recording of answers to questions from Nizovtseva, deputy chairperson of the Central Auditing Commission of the party Central Committee.

Nizovtseva says: "I have been asked where salaries come from, in particular for the members of the Politburo—Comrades Ryzhkov, Maslyukov, Shevardnadze, Kryuchkov—and people combining state posts with the Politburo. All candidate members and members of the Politburo of the party Central Committee get a salary in the party Central Committee, including heads of the government, ministries, and departments. Exceptions are candidate members and members of the Central Committee Politburo who are also members of the Presidential Council. They will get their salary in the apparatus of the Presidential Council.

"For your information, and also in answer to questions contained here, salaries for members of the Politburo are 1,200 rubles [R] per month; to candidate members of the Politburo R1,100, and secretaries R1,000."

Nizovtseva then deals with a question about the money spent on the Lenin museum in Gorkiy—which was R850,000 from the party budget in 1989—and remarks that all the branches of the Lenin museums should become more lively and less museum-like and be centers for defending Lenin's ideas.

She then deals with a question about who pays party activists when they attend party functions and are entitled to receive an average wage, and defends the fact that it is the party which provides this money.

Novitskaya then says that the report of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission was confirmed, and delegates then heard answers to their questions from Nikolay Yefimovich Kruchina, administrator of the CPSU Central Committee, who delivered a report on budget and property.

Kruchina says: "Delegate Comrade (Kryukov) asks for information about the expected cost of holding the 28th CPSU Congress point by point.

"Wages of delegates for the days of the Congress' work: more than R700,000.

"Sum of transport expenditure: about R500,000.

"Accommodation and reservation in hotels: about R800,000.

"Travelling expenses: up to R800,000.

"Cost of radio and television broadcasting—from what was adopted up to now—about R4.5 million.

"Spending on hiring the hall and telephone lines: R460,000.

"Transport of delegates guests to Moscow and back: R459,000.

"Other (?administrative) costs: R1,880,000.

"So the total amount—of course I can't guarantee that this is the final sum since not all expenditures have been submitted to us yet and are not known—the total expenditure on holding the 28th CPSU Congress, taking into account expenditure on broadcasting by radio and television is, if we follow the timetable we have confirmed of ten days, R11 million, about R11 million.

"A question has been asked about the average salary of workers in the Central Committee apparatus. The average salary of a Central Committee worker according to the pay for the job is R406, and for technical workers it is R240. The general one is 406, responsible workers get 533, and technical workers get R240."

Kruchina then deals with a question from some delegates about spending on the CPSU's international activity and foreign currency income, and whether the Central Committee has foreign bank deposits. He says it has no bank accounts or property abroad. He says there are many questions based on rumors about foreign bank accounts being held by Politburo members and whether this money could not be put to use to improve the life of the people. Kruchina gives an impassioned and lengthy rebuttal of this idea, stressing that the current leadership is nothing like the previous ones.

Novitskaya then says that the report was adopted as a basis and it will be worked on.

Novitskaya winds up her report by saying that work has started again after a short break, and Lizichev is speaking on the basic directions of the party's military policy.

Moldavia's Luchinskiy Gives News Conference

LD0907120190 Moscow TASS in English 1145 GMT 9 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS—The debate at the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress has not produced enough specific proposals for the solution of real problems encountered by society, Moldavian Communist Party chief Petr Luchinsky told a news conference today. At the same time he noted that the decisions to be made at the congress might influence developments in the country.

Regarding possible candidates for the post of Soviet Communist Party Chief, Luchinskiy said that in the present situation hardly anyone but Mikhail Gorbachev can be considered seriously. "I am confident Gorbachev will be elected," he said.

Regarding the forthcoming elections of deputy chief of the Soviet Communist Party, the Moldavian communist leader said that among the possible candidatures the names of president of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Vladimir Ivashko, Chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions Gennadiy Yanayev and Soviet Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin have been mentioned.

Luchinskiy said he prefers Vladimir Ivashko, who, he believes, has the necessary experience and understands the processes taking place in the country.

Luchinskiy was asked about the possibility of Yegor Ligachev's nomination as party chief. "I have long been acquainted with Ligachev and I regard him as a man of integrity, hard-working and with an active position in life, but the situation is such that whether we want it nor not, his attitudes split the party," Luchinskiy said. He said he believes Ligachev's nomination would only aggravate the situation in the party.

Regarding Moldavia's future, Luchinskiy said Moldavian people are not striving to withdraw from the USSR. This was shown also by the recent public opinion poll in Moldavia, which showed that only four per cent of Moldavian citizens believe that unification with Romania is possible, he said.

Assessing the situation in the Moldavian Communist Party, Luchinskiy said that 8,000 out of the 200,000 Moldavian communists have already quit the party and that this process is gathering pace.

Ryzhkov States Party Split Must Be Avoided

LD0707125490 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Report on Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov's answers to domestic and foreign journalists' questions at the 28th CPSU Congress in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 7 July]

[Text] Nikolay Ryzhkov said that although criticism was dominating at the congress, much in line with the current vogue, the forum's main job is to produce a strategy of how the party could operate under newly emerging conditions. Nikolay Ryzhkov complained that the subject was given little attention by the delegates. He said many of the party's methods when it had a monopoly on power were largely outdated now that the country was embarking on a multi-party democracy. He said many of the delegates would be confused to say what's to be done next when they are back to their places.

Nikolay Ryzhkov named the mood of intolerance by a sizeable part of the delegtes as one of the shortcomings of the congress. He strongly criticized the attempts at shouting down prominent figures of the cultural world, such as David Kugultinov, Mikhail Ulyanov, and Chingiz Aytmatov. Instead of heeding to what they had to say, he went on, part of the delegates tried to boo them.

On the possibility of resignation by party and government leaders if no progress is made in two years, Nikolay Ryzhkov said the main job was to get a reversal for the better. If not, he said, new blood will arrive to replace this leadership which will go down in history as the initiator of reform.

On the difficulties of economic reform Nikolay Ryzhkov indicated government plans were being met with a certain degree of caution on the ground, but the groundwork of reform laid down by the government would help towards crucial changes in the economy. The government's main job was to create conditions for the operation of the entire state machinery, he said, but many found them not to their liking. Living standards are being criticized on the one hand, but on the other attempts are being made to prevent a crucial change. Nikolay Ryzhkov expressed certainty that the nation would realize the need for crucial reform. Nikolay Ryzhkov was also asked whether he thought the congress would end in a party split.

In his view no major split was in the cards at the congress itself but what will happen within the party later is entirely in the hand of the congress. He said a strategy must be worked out now to avoid a party split after the congress.

Gorbachev Comments on Congress Proceedings 4 July

PM0907145690 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 5 Jul 90 p 4

[Dispatch by Asmund Willersrud: "'No Doubts About My Course'"]

[Excerpts] "No one has expressed doubts about my course. The discussion is about how we can make perestroyka even better. That is the most important thing about this party congress," Mikhail Gorbachev declared yesterday.

In a conversation with a handful of Western journalists—including SVENSKA DAGBLADET's correspondent—who were allowed through the iron ring of bodyguards in the congress auditorium, the hard-pressed Soviet leader shared his thoughts about the course the congress was taking. [Passage omitted]

During the short conversation he also defended his reform policy which has been under fire ever since the opening minutes of the congress. "What we have done in the last few years has been an important school. Now the point of departure is a good one for moving the reforms onto an even more thorough track—on the way toward the regulated market economy. We have economic experience, the work of construction is under way, and the law on land leasing and ownership rights provides us with a base for further progress," Gorbachev said, defending his fundamental ideas against orthodox criticism.

"Also," he said before disappearing into the huge auditorium, "we have the mighty Communist Party. It is the most powerful political organization in existence," he said, saying farewell with an optimistic "Do svidaniya"—"Goodbye." [Passage omitted]

Shevardnadze on Congress, Cyprus Issue

NC0707155990 Athens RIZOSPASTIS in Greek 7 Jul 90 p 3

[From Moscow correspondent Yiannis Litsos; date of interview not given]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze's speech at the 28th CPSU Congress made a special impression on the delegates and on Soviet public opinion. In addition, many of the conferees mentioned the government and party's foreign policy in their speeches, especially on Thursday, to the working group which is dealing with foreign affairs.

Several conferees criticized the foreign minister and the government's policy, alleging that the country "has lost its allies and friends," that "it has found itself in the same situation as in 1939," and so forth. However most delegates had a different opinion and considered that in recent years perestroyka had achieved impressive results in foreign policy. One of the regional problems to whose solution the USSR wants to contribute is the Cyprus problem.

Our discussion with Eduard Shevardnadze began from that point and about what was discussed in Washington at the recent summit meeting.

[Shevardnadze] This time we discussed the Cyprus problem with the U.S. leaders. We seek ways for the success of the UN secretary general's mission.

[Litsos] Is there hope for a just and quick solution?

[Shevardnadze] One should be found. There is no other way except a political settlement.

[Litsos] There has been talk about your trip to Greece for a long time. Is there a specific date?

[Shevardnadze] I intend to visit your country, but the specific time has yet to be decided. I hope to make this trip as soon as possible.

[Litsos] The situation in southern Europe, contrary to other areas of our continent, remains tense. Do you not think that it is time for radical measures to reduce tension?

[Shevardnadze] I will give my answer during my visit to Greece and Cyprus. Indeed, this is a very serious matter, an area that needs special attention. However, the main responsibility belongs to the countries and peoples of the area.

[Litsos] What do you say about the NATO summit conference that is being held in London?

[Shevardnadze] I do not know yet what final decisions will be made there. I believe, however, that the realistic political personalities of the West understand that NATO needs changes, changes resulting from the continuous lessening of military confrontation in Europe. We know the proposals of President Bush and other Western leaders. Many of the things that have been stated in London (Editor's note: The resolutions had not been made at the time of the interview.) are steps in the right direction.

[Litsos] How do you evaluate the work of the 28th congress so far?

[Shevardnadze] It is a very interesting congress. Various views are being expressed. There are differences. I think the congress reflects the procedures that are currently taking place in our society. One should not be surprised at the variety of views being expressed at the congress, behind the scenes and in the information media. Personally, I think this is natural in a democratic society. Of course, sometimes emotions and not reason prevail.

[Litsos] While cricicizing foreign policy some people stressed that its substance is to be found in the fact of constant concessions by the USSR....

[Shevardnadze] We are conceding nothing to anyone. These things are being said by people who do not know the reality and are not following developments. Regarding the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from East

Europe. I believe that this is natural and should surprise no one. I believe that these are correct decisions. From the moment these states do not want Soviet troops on their soil, we are compelled to take this into consideration and resolve the issue accordingly.

[Litsos] Whom do you see in the post of party secretary general and alternate secretary general?

[Shevardnadze] We find ourselves in a transitional period, and I am convinced that we need to combine the post of the president of the country and the post of the CPSU secretary general. I am not in a position to answer about the post of alternate secretary general.

Correspondents' Impressions of 4 July Session

PM0507151490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 90 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Report from the Kremlin by special correspondents D. Gorbuntsov, N. Demidov, V. Yegorov, A. Lopukhin, S. Pastukhov, and A. Shinkin: "Congress Chronicle, Day Three"]

[Text] To begin our reportage with generalities, let us note at once: The third day of work at the 28th congress began with the same questions as the first day, questions raised in the report of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 28th CPSU Congress and the Party's Tasks." Let us remind you of a few of them. Has the turnaround that began in April five years ago proved justified? How are the crisis phenomena to be overcome? What is the party's place in the new conditions, what form should it take politically, ideologically, and organizationally? What must be done to revive it as a revolutionary organization of working people enjoying the people's confidence?

These are, of course, serious questions, and they are unlikely to be "extinguished" by the "fire brigade" by means of the orator's art or any other art. They demand answers—direct, precise, and concrete—and the first speeches in the debate set the tone, to some extent, for the third day of the congress. S. Gurenko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, A. Porutchikov, director of a sovkhoz [state farm] in Penza Oblast, and other speakers discussed the most important thing: the people's fate and the party's role. Their speeches will be published in PRAVDA, so that readers can familiarize themselves with them, and we think they will reach the same conclusion. USSR People's Deputy V. Grigoryev, first secretary of Vitebsk Belorussian Communist Party Obkom [oblast committee], has not yet spoken from the platform, but has a clearly defined stance. He said to us:

"Our delegation was given instructions at the oblast party conference. First, to do everything to prevent a split in the party. Second, to wage war on antisocialist forces, which means, in the opinion of the Vitebsk communists, antiperestroyka forces. And, third: The party should lend its weight to a regulated market economy, while at the same time, of course, ensuring the social protection of working people. Unless we do this at the congress, I am afraid the party will find itself left on the sidelines of social development. It is worrying that by no means all the delegates understand the urgent need for radical economic transformations.

"We are hearing talk at the congress of how party is losing prestige. Unfortunately this trend can indeed be observed. But I am resolutely opposed to panic. The CPSU is still the main political force, and it is on the CPSU that the majority of the people pin their hopes for a better life. It is significant that more than 20,000 nonparty people took part, in our oblast, in the discussion of precongress documents, which you might think were purely party documents. So people are not indifferent to our fate. It is gratifying that a certain increase in party ranks has also taken shape recently. And more representatives of the intelligentsia have begun to join the ranks of the CPSU. Another indicator of our confidence and strength is the fact that we are talking calmly about a multiparty system. In my view it is very useful. If I can put it like this, our political opponents fulfill the role of a kind of emery paper, removing the rust.

"And what about the question of how the congress is going? I think we will fulfill our task if we can find and promote to the party leadership a galaxy of young leaders, aged, say, 30 or 40, who will be able to take responsible, principled decisions without suffering from fear of the nomenklatura."

Our conversation with I. Ibragimov, chairman of the Azerbaijan republic department of the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund and academician of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences, began with an interesting observation:

"This is the third time I have been elected a delegate to the party congress. And this is what struck me immediately. The atmosphere is entirely different. Whereas formerly a decorous unanimity prevailed in the auditorium, and during the breaks people walked about staidly as if it was the interval at the theater, today real passions seethe at the microphones during the sessions and flare up in the foyer and even outside the palace, where delegates who are smokers prefer to spend their free moments. And another thing. Believe me, as an old hand, if I can put it like that: The 28th congress is a congress of entirely new people. Those whom perestroyka has brought forward. Of course, you notice that many people let their emotions spill over and lack tolerance of other people's opinions, but I am sure that the art of political ethics is something that comes with practice. You need some experience behind you.

"You must also record without fail the following opinion of mine, the opinion of a communist since the war year of 1943. If the party is to stand firm, revitalize itself, and win the political struggle, a consolidation of party ranks is needed. I think this will be promoted by the principled decision our congress has taken: to hear reports from leaders in the party's top echelon. And I see the main purpose of this as not to ferret out old sins, but to provide a lesson for future leaders—from the primary organization to the Politburo. Now everyone will know that he personally is answerable from now on.

"But this is what surprises me. So many radical things have been said about the separation of power—economic and party power—but some speakers seem not to have heard them, when they raise purely production matters that should be dealt with by the soviets, the government, or the departments..."

"We are doing a great deal of talking," A. Abdukarimov, team leader of a Komsomol [communist youth league] youth team of cotton growers at the "Maksim Gorkiy" Kolkhoz [collective farm] in Tajikistan's Kurgan-Tyube Oblast, sighs. "I am afraid that at this rate we will not get the job done in 10 days."

"We have the harvest, at home," his fellow countrywoman Gulinor Ruziyeva, cotton growers' team leader at the "Lenin" Kolkhoz in Kulyab Oblast, adds. "We understand that we have to decide important matters here, but at heart you are wondering: How are things in the fields?"

"But perhaps," her fellow countryman smiled, "things will go better in the fields because of how we decide these matters. I plan to say this in the agrarian section: Cotton prices remain low, yet prices for agricultural equipment, spare parts, and fuel are rising all the time. So how can you go over to a market system? The people are afraid that then we will be utterly ruined. The party should define its position clearly here, because, you see, this is not merely an economic matter, but a political matter."

"As a woman, here is something else that worries me," Gulinor adds, "all is not well in the nationalities policy of the state, and that means the party. In our republic things seem calm at the moment, but party work must be carried out in future in such a way as to ensure that where we live and in every other region of the country people live together in harmony, like brothers. And it is sad that even at the congress people who are representatives of different republics, but the same party, sometimes cannot find a common language."

"I would like to say a couple of words about the division of delegates along various social lines," A. Kalinichev, machine operator and leader of a lease collective on the Vologda Oblast "Pravda" Kolkhoz, said, joining in the conversation. "This division is, in my opinion, a purely arithmetical approach. A writer, a scientist, or a party worker can defend the interests of a manual laborer even better than the worker himself. After all, it is no secret that in the past, the quite recent past, we ordinary working people were often exploited as a reliable voting machine. The apparatus draws up a resolution, and we mechanically raise our hands. Even now, as I see it, some people are not averse to retaining this system. Yet it makes people obedient servants and prevents them from being autonomous and thinking something up or inventing their own ideas. In our area local leaders are constantly looking up, waiting for instructions from the center about every issue. That is why the lease contract system, on which my own team is working quite well, is having difficulties on other farms, and indeed even for us not everything is going smoothly. A good many office workers would not mind a share of our pie."

From the approving rejoinders and concrete examples that were cited, we can see that the thoughts of the peasant Kalinichev met with understanding from N. Kechkin, first secretary of Yegorevsk CPSU Gorkom [city committee] (Moscow Oblast), V. Drovennikov, a Muscovite and political scientist, and other participants in our conversation.

We do not know how much longer this ardent, committed discussion would have gone on, but a persistent bell summoned everyone to the continuation of the congress session. And the same ardor and commitment were displayed there.

Whatever speech you listened to at the congress, it invariably touched to some extent on the CPSU's future, its tomorrow. And even in the breaks between sessions the delegates continued the debate, so to speak. We heard the most diverse, sometimes opposite opinions, but it seems that all the same the most important thing is the communists' shared concern for their party's fate.

And indeed, what paths of renewal will restore its prestige and prompt the millions of CPSU members into activeness? In the conditions of perestroyka their place is once again in the front line, when not the apparatus, but the collective intelligence of the actual organizations, large organizations, will take the most important decisions for the people's sake. Economic questions are now addressed to soviet organs. But that does not mean that the party has distanced itself from resolving them, many delegates think.

"The people and communists are worried," P. Dubalar, first secretary of Kamenetskiy party raykom [rayon committee] (Moldova), says. "And the reason for their agitation is the uncertainty. It is no accident that the rayon's communists unanimously supported these instructions: Do everything at the congress to define clearly where we are going and what must be done to that end. The party organizations should not go on working in the way they work today. You ask: What am I myself doing as first secretary, why do I not restructure my work? We are not sitting idle. We have plenty of worries. We lack clear guidelines in perestroyka. Often we are snubbed from higher up: Don't put your nose in here, don't interfere in that... As a result we yield all our positions without a struggle. And our place is taken by other forces, by no means better, which do not by any means operate by parliamentary methods."

All the same, how did the third day of the congress go in general? We discussed this question among ourselves for a long time, and apparently agreed on one thing: It was uneven. And the hitches began from the morning. I. Polozkov, who was in the chair, had to begin with amendments to the order for the morning session. As a change to the list of speakers approved the previous day, by a decision of the delegates, the floor was given first, out of turn, to G. Bukharkov, a miner at the "Chelyuskintsy" pit of the "Donetskugol" Association. He read out the proposed text of an appeal from the 28th CPSU Congress delegates from the coal regions to the congress, the president, the government, and the country's miners, which says, in particular, that in these difficult times it is necessary to show prudence, to adopt a reasoned approach to the problems of our life, and to understand that a policy of strong-arm tactics and ultimatums could lead to the collapse of the economy, adversely affect the course of perestroyka, and lower people's living standards. The congress supported this appeal.

The speakers' speeches were not uniform, and the delegates' reaction to them was not uniform either. They tried to give some people the slow handclap, while others were given support in the form of tumultuous applause reminiscent of the good old days. Some of the speakers went astray and failed to abide by the standing orders...

Well, people are people. They can miscalculate, they can make mistakes. And that includes us journalists. Thus in yesterday's report, because of the reporter's tight schedule, Credentials Commission Chairman Yu. Manayenkov's words were inaccurately quoted. Let us quote them here in accordance with the stenographic transcript: "The Credentials Commission asks the congress to grant to three representatives of the Nagorno-Karabakh party organization who are here in this auditorium the right to a consultative voice as guests."

On the basis of numerous requests, at the end of the debate the floor was given to Academician L. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

At the end of the evening session the congress approved the composition of the commissions for preparing resolutions—"On CPSU Policy in Conducting Economic Reform and Adopting Urgent Measures To Stabilize the Socioeconomic Situation in the Country"; "On the Main Guidelines for CPSU Agrarian Policy in the Conditions of Radicalization of the Economic Reform"; "On the CPSU's Youth Policy."

The delegates approved proposals on forming commissions to draft resolutions on interethnic issues, on the basic guidelines for CPSU military policy at the present stage, and on the political evaluation of the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster. Ch. Aytmatov, A. Lizichev, and A. Kamay were elected their respective chairmen.

Today the congress will continue its work in sections.

Belorussian Communists Hold News Conference

LD0407141290 Moscow TASS in English 1351 GMT 4 Jul 90

[by TASS correspondents Leonid Timofeyev and Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—The overwhelming majority of Belorussian communists believe one person should hold the posts of Communist Party general secretary and Soviet president, according to Belorussian Communist Party leader Yefrem Sokolov, speaking at a press conference by the Belorrussian communist delegation to the 28th party congress.

"Mikhail Gorbachev began perestroyka, and he should continue it to see its results," Sokolov noted.

Leader of the Grodno regional party committee Vladimir Semenov stressed that delegation members are "concerned that neither the political report nor reports by Politburo members contained replies to many questions of interest to communists".

They do not contain the theoretical substantiation of perestroyka, he said. Theoretical studies by scientists, politologists, sociologists and economists lag behind events, he continued.

"I'm apprehensive that we may begin our activities after the congress guided only by one major work: 'Perestroyka. New thinking for our country and the world' by Gorbachev," Semenov stressed.

Speaking about the attitude of the republican party organisation to Belorussia's sovereignty, Semenov noted that the latest plenary meeting of the Belorussian party central committee adopted an appropriate decision.

One paragraph reads that the Belorussian Communist Party supports the idea of the republic's political and economic sovereignty within the USSR.

Dealing with the same theme, Sokolov emphasised that "the Lithuanian alternative" is unacceptable to the republic. He favoured "unity in the fraternal family of Soviet nations".

According to Sokolov, solid party and state sovereignty should not disrupt relations with other peoples and parties.

Semenov informed the gathering that Belorussian communists would submit a proposal to the congress on adopting a resolution on the CPSU's attitude to the Socialist International.

Old documents, operating now, are "at variance with the practices of inter-parliamentary relations," he noted.

Semenov said that the Belorussian delegation would insist on holding the second stage of the 28th congress this autumn. It should approve the party programme after the first stage adopts the CPSU rules, he noted.

CPSU Congress Speakers Cited on Mideast

LD0607204190 Kuwait KUNA in English 2002 GMT 6 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, July 6 (KUNA)—Head of the Nationalities Council of the Soviet Parliament Rafiq Nishanov on Friday renewed Moscow's opposition to the resettlement of Soviet Jewish immigrants in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories.

Nishanov, talking to KUNA on the sidelines of the Communist Party's 28th ongoing congress, said the Kremlin's latest proposal for a summit of Arab "frontline" states is designed to bring about a fair settlement of the Middle East conflict.

The Soviet parliamentarian, who served as Moscow's ambassador to Amman for [word indistinct] years, stressed that a just settlement of the Middle East crisis should safeguard the national rights of the Palestinian people.

Meanwhile, head of the parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee Aleksandr Dzasokov urged the world community to be more actively involved in efforts to settle the Middle East's "chronic" conflict.

He particularly blamed the Middle East stalemate on the "negative" U.S. attitude and he called on Washington to resume the dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization, halted by the American Administration last month.

Another Communist Party official told a press conference Arabs, including the PLO, cannot be blamed for the peace deadlock in the Middle East.

Head of the party's Central Committee international department Valentin Falin said: "We know the reasons that created this situation." He did not elaborate.

Falin also called for resumption of the U.S.-PLO dialogue saying the talk between the two sides, begun in December 1988, had helped solve "some issues" and pave the way for a settlement in the region.

Kazakh Delegate Comments on Yeltsin, Ryzhkov

PM0907115790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by G. Alimov and V. Litovkin: "At the 28th CPSU Congress Press Center"]

[Excerpts] A meeting between the Kazakh delegation and Soviet and foreign journalists took place at the 28th CPSU Congress Press Center 7 July. Opening the meeting, N. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the [Kazakh] Communist Party Central Committee and president of the republic, said that their delegation is one of the largest with 207 people. [passage omitted]

[IZVESTIYA] How do you assess the course of discussions at the congress? How did you react to Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's speech?

[Nazarbayev] We will still have to assess everything that has happened. It seems to me that the fact that more than 44 percent of delegates at the congress are party workers is leaving its mark. Summing up the speeches, it can be said that basically everybody is campaigning for our party's unity, for the retention of the federation, and for the improvement of the people's life. This unites us. However, the divergence of opinions has been very great. It would, of course, be desirable to have more constructive proposals on how to generate political space for the party itself and how to democratize it. The main stage—the adoption of documents—is now starting. The main arguments will be in this area. Let me be frank: I do not like the fact that we have still not learned to accept other opinions. I cannot consider it normal that Mikhail Aleksandrovich Ulyanov and Chingiz Aytmatov were not allowed to finish their speeches.

Now about Comrade Yeltsin's speech. When he was conducting his election campaign for the mandate of Russian people's deputy and fighting for the post of Supreme Soviet chairman, I disagreed with many of his public assessments. The main point here is his idea about the sovereignty of rural and rayon soviets when, for instance, rural soviets will repeal decisions made by rayon soviets and so forth right up to the very top. It would be impossible to run a state like that. I think that Yeltsin's speech at this congress has shown that he has come closer to the center. That is how it struck me, and it is gratifying.

[Question from an Egyptian correspondent] You have expressed a negative attitude toward certain Politburo members. Could you say why?

[Nazarbayev] I did not express a negative attitude in my speech. My criticism does not mean that I have a bad relationship with anyone. I criticized Comrade Medvedev for shortcomings in ideological work. And I reaffirm that opinion. Local organizations have received no help from the central party staff's ideological service. And the responsibility for this lies with the Politburo member entrusted with that sector. I criticized the government leadership for its inconsistency and for the inadequate work done on the decisions it made. These decisions have subsequently had to be repealed. There is no concept or strategy for the country's economic transformation. That is why I criticized Comrade Ryzhkov and his deputies. I still believe that Ryzhkov is a highly competent person and in every respect a well-prepared leader, but his mistake is that he has remained devoted to the ministries, departments, and his comrades from the stagnation era.

Arkhangelsk Deputy Notes Unproductive Discussions

LD0707153390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0600 GMT on 7 July carries a three-minute interview with Arkhangelsk Oblast CPSU Congress Deputy Andrey Andreyevich Maslennikov by an unidentified correspondent. Maslennikov, who represents the CPSU Democratic Platform, speaks of the distressing impression made by the speeches in which the same old slogans are being promoted, although the crucial issue of the party's very existence is being discussed in reality. He complains of delegates' attitudes toward opposing opinions and the uncouth behavior in the auditorioum.

Maslennikov: "Yesterday we met with Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev. He also has something of a despondent impression from that. But he says that nonetheless fate will in the end not be decided here, but moreover beyond the walls of the congress. And he puts his hopes in the young people. He is placing serious hopes in young people." Maslennikov concludes that people do not know how to work in a new way. They are accustomed to command. He says that such leaders as Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev give one reason for optimism, but that productive discussion at the congress is only found in the corridors.

Delegates Reportedly Neglect Workers' Interests

PM0607161190 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 6 Jul 90 p 1

[Report by V. Kachurin, Political and Legal Culture Department editor, under the general heading "The 28th CPSU Congress" and the rubric "Editor's Opinion": "What Lies Beyond the Kremlin Walls"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] I agree that we have not chosen the most convenient time for the sittings. The busy harvest period is already beginning, when the work done today, as the saying goes, feeds us for the rest of the year. And yet I cannot understand the impetuousness with which some people were demanding to speak and the impatience with which speakers were sometimes cut off in midsentence. Why do such things happen? Let us recall a typical moment. When M.S. Gorbachev, in his speech, spoke about the social reorientation of the economy and its resolute turn toward the individual, and at the same time mentioned a growth in commodity turnover, the hall livened up perceptibly. Maybe there is a growth, but you cannot see any goods in the stores. Alas, the desired turn toward the individual has not taken place.

Indeed, it is because the people do not perceive any real improvements that it is difficult for the general secretary, the Politburo members, and the secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee to render reports today at the congress. Of course, the delegates noted, people must pay more attention to their own personal contribution in various matters. Our politics must be personified and not faceless, as it was before. There were even attempts to give some people the slow handclap, forgetting about the standing orders. [passage omitted]

So how are we to assess the way the congress is progressing? Where is it going—left or right? Is it possible that everything depends on whom the delegates sympathize with: the radicals or the conservatives? The congress, whether you like it or not, reflects the whole spectrum of opinions that exist in the broad strata of communists. It seems to me that this is not just a question of views, but of the purposefulness with which everyone defends their position.

And at the same time, it has become obvious that many of the speakers, particularly high-ranking party workers, almost considered it their duty to "intercede for" the leader of perestroyka, on whom reproaches were undeservedly heaped. Although I believe that M.S. Gorbachev, whose prestige in the world is high, does not need such "support." Notes from the hall lead to this conclusion, demanding that his name should not be uttered in a eulogistic tone. This is understandable: After all, various cults and minicults are still fresh in people's minds, and the congress is also concerned about not letting these be formed again. It is not the personality in the high post that needs to be "rescued," but the party, whose very existence is now under threat.

Indeed, the congress did not meet in order to make a snap judgment, M.S. Gorbachev noted in his report. The communists' forum must answer various alarming questions. Has the change started in 1985 proved itself? What is the party's place in the new situation? What should be done to renew the CPSU? [passage omitted]

What is happening in the Kremlin must not be taken out of the context of the alarming events that are unfolding in the country. It is not enough to triumph in verbal exchanges. We must lay the foundations of a renewed party, which will also be able to head the workers' movement. In the final analysis, it must be admitted, in many workers regions people do not see "their" representatives among the congress delegates. Not just because they occupy positions in the apparatus, but also because they frequently only protect the nomenklatura's interests. And they do not perceive the life that is pulsating around them. And as for the hopes of rank and file communists, well, these aspirations lie beyond the Kremlin walls...

Democratic Platform Views Gorbachev Speech

PM0607144990 London ITV Television Network in English 1800 GMT 3 Jul 90

[Interview with Vacheslav Shostakovskiy, leader of the Democratic Platform, in Russian with superimposed English translation, by news presenter Jon Snow in Moscow; recorded "earlier today"]

[Text] [Snow] I asked Mr. Shostakovskiy whether he sees this congress as the conservative counterrevolution or their last hurrah.

[Shostakovskiy] I do believe that—as to the last hurrah—I do not think that for the party it will be the last congress, even if it does not undergo radical changes, as will probably happen. This is because of the specific conditions of the party in our country.

[Snow] Now people on the right of the party seem to have drawn quite a lot of comfort from what Mr. Gorbachev said yesterday. And you on the left, did you get anything out of his speech?

[Shostakovskiy] I was disappointed by several aspects of the report. First of all by the analysis of the present moment, which at first glance was sharp enough but in fact did not analyze everything which is going on in society. The report did not give the analysis of the political situation in the country and in the party. Second, there was an admission both in the political report and the program of the party of a critical situation and defects, but nowhere was the attempt made to find out what caused this. The report just skated over it.

[Snow] Now it is obvious that the Democratic Platform only occupies a very small amount of ground in this congress. If you do not succeed in making enough points, are you prepared to abandon congress and just go for your own direction?

[Shostakovskiy] We are an obvious minority. We forecasted it, we expected it: Only two percent of congress delegates support the policies of Democratic Platform, but we are making efforts to form a broader base to block [as heard] for democratic unity.

[Snow] You are an important party employee: Are you going to lose your job?

[Shostakovskiy] Without any doubt. I believe the decision to relieve me of my duties was taken months ago. Simply people are not in any hurry to carry out this decision. They are waiting for the results of the congress. At least two secretaries of the Central Committee have talked about it in different places, fully confident that it would be so: Ligachev twice and Secretary Medvedev—they were saying that I have been relieved of my job. But even if they had not said it, certainly conservative forces would not allow me to remain in the party and at my job.

Committee Chairman Opposes Party Factionalism

PM0607080390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jul 90 Single Edition p 3

[S. Karkhanin report on interview with Professor Yu.Kh. Kalmykov, 28th CPSU Congress delegate and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Legislation, place, and date unspecified; under the rubric "Summary of Speech": "In Accordance With the Law"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Professor Yu.Kh. Kalmykov from Saratov is a delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Legislation. The topic upon which he reflects is the party in the conditions of a developing rule-of-law state. The delegate now shares these thoughts with SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA readers:

I do not know whether I will get to speak at the congress or not: The Secretariat has already received some 600 requests from delegates wishing to speak. I would like to talk about something that has given me hope. In his report, M.S. Gorbachev said that the CPSU is pursuing a policy to end the situation where all power is concentrated in its hands and, in any case, to draw a clear line between state power and party and ideological work. This is a fundamental point: You cannot build a rule-of-law state any other way.

Speakers argue a great deal about whether our party should be a vanguard party or a parliamentary party. I personally feel, however, that one certainly does not exclude the other. A vanguard role can be achieved by parliamentary methods, as a result of winning elections to bodies of power. It is true that we in the CPSU must create the appropriate structures for this that will guarantee such a victory; we do not have these structures at present, although the multiparty system is becoming reality before our very eyes. We have something to think about in this respect at the congress. I am a communist and naturally would like to see my party as the vanguard party. But that can only be achieved in the ways envisaged by the USSR Constitution and the new wording of Article 6, i.e. by bringing our influence to bear on political life through our representatives in the soviets and other bodies.

Which laws regulate party activity? The country's Constitution and the future law on social associations, approved by the Supreme Soviet on the first reading; and the basis for internal party relations is the CPSU Statute. I am a member of the working group that is preparing the new draft statute. There are a great many problems and all I can say at present is how I personally view these problems. I believe there is a point in abandoning the term "democratic centralism," because it has been fairly discredited in the past. Although, naturally, party discipline and the election of leading bodies should not be abandoned.

I am also opposed to factions within the CPSU. The draft statute guarantees communists' freedom by freedom of opinion and discussion and referendums. But the party must be united by common objectives and methods. Whoever disagrees with them cannot remain in the party, in my opinion. And as far as the fate of party property is concerned, which is now being so much discussed, calls to "nationalize" this property conflict with our new Law on Ownership. In disputed cases, however, the question must again be decided in accordance with the law, i.e. through the courts.

It has recently been proposed to adopt a separate law on political parties. I do not think that this idea is very well founded: There are clauses on parties in the draft law on social associations. In particular, it indicates what kind of party can be recognized as an all-Union party: Only those parties which exist in the majority of the Union republics and have no less than 1,000 members. True, I do feel that the figure has been set too low: In other countries with considerably smaller populations, it is more likely to be 10-30,000 members. We have instructed scientists to study foreign experience of political parties' legislative regulation and practical activity: We need a scientific basis to finalize the draft law.

I must admit that so far the CPSU has made little use of its right of legislative initiative: There has only been one case where it has done so—with the new wording of Article 6 of the Constitution. Representatives of the CPSU leadership rarely speak at Supreme Soviet sessions. I feel that the party could prepare alternative draft laws on social associations, the press, and freedom of conscience, i.e. those directly connected with political activity. Especially as the Central Committee has the Commission on Legal Questions with highly qualified cadres at its disposal. It is not a matter of interfering in the Supreme Soviet's work but of exercising your constitutional right in the party's interests. In time, incidentally, when other parties in our country become stronger, there will obviously be an objective need for a faction of communist deputies in the Supreme Soviet.

And the last point. In my view, the new Politburo must be made up of real leaders with authority in the party and among the people, which, perhaps, is something that could not be said of some of the present representatives of the CPSU leadership. Otherwise we cannot win in competition with other parties. People must be promoted and found. We have to start thinking about elections to bodies of authority that are going to be held four or five years from now. Government activity is also not a matter of indifference for the ruling party. The government's prestige is not very high at present, although I am sure that N.I. Ryzhkov's potential as leader of the Council of Ministers is still far from exhausted. So the government must be reorganized and those ministers who are not living up to their responsibilities replaced. As far as I am concerned, that means the leaders of the Ministry of Railways, the Ministry of the Coal Industry, and the State Committee for Public Education.... The unpopular program proposed by the government for transferring to a market economy has essentially been thrown out by the Supreme Soviet, so our party leadership and all of us have something to think about.

Congress Delegates Out of Tune With Public

PM0507154590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V. Boykov and Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Ye. Levanov: "The Mood of the Delegates and of Society"]

[Text] The kaleidoscope of political events has made the people weary, you might think. However, a national public opinion poll conducted by the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Socialist Sciences Sociological Research Center on 25-27 June showed that 67% of the population will be following its work. Some are indifferent—15%.

But the interest in this event is not the interest that was shown in the previous congress. This time it is a demanding, morbid, contradictory, suspicious interest. For instance, only 28% of the respondents expect the congress to provide the impetus to get society out of the crisis, and half of them doubt that it will.

The optimists will not be disappointed, while the disillusioned could acquire faith in the party as long as the congress delegates do not shut themselves off from the people behind a wall of personal ambition and procedural questions. The danger is that the prevailing mood among the delegates may not coincide with the trend of public opinion, with the expectations of the communists who sent them there, those for whom perestroyka is certainly not merely a matter of battles within the apparatus.

In this connection, let us compare the results of the aforesaid national opinion poll with the opinions of the 3,987 delegates who also filled in sociological questionnaires during registration.

It is gratifying, above all, to see a great deal of agreement between the population's and the delegates' assessments of the gravity of the problems besetting our society. They include the declining living standards, crime wave, interethnic conflicts, the massive environmental pollution, and so on. But what perturbs people is whether these really glaring issues will be eclipsed by the arguments between supporters of different political platforms.

There has been a shift in that direction, and a considerable one at that. For instance, 62% of the delegates indicated that what worries them most is the state of affairs in the party. There is no harm in that: After all, it is a party congress. Things are indeed in grave disarray. But the worrying thing is that only 55% of the delegates displayed a desire to unite efforts and currents in the face of the threat of disaster.

The main obstacle in the way of achieving a consensus is the different positions on fundamental questions of restructuring society. It was distinctly evident at the first stage of the founding congress of the Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. For example, a substantial proportion of the delegates (12%) was resolutely opposed to the development of the economy's private sector even to the minimum degree; an equal number of people see it as the only salvation. Views were polarized on the question of cooperatives, on how to unite the republics, and on how to resolve party matters. So, some (17%) see clearing out the advocates of the "old" work style as the way to strengthen the CPSU. Others—considerably more of them (30%)—are prepared to wage an uncompromising struggle against communists whose faith in the traditional ideals of socialism is unshaken.

When asked "Whose interests should take pride of place in the elaboration of state policy?" 81% gave priority to human beings over the needs of nations, classes, and the state. Only recently the opposite applied. But here is the rub: Only eight percent of the respondents in the public opinion poll believe that party organs can protect "ordinary" people's interests. Incidentally, the soviets' organs are not up to par either. Only 14% of the respondents expect protection from them.

People feel like orphans in society, because for many years the emphasis has been on recording, but not dealing with, their concerns. The latter demands powerful authority in the center and locally. So it is the party's task to support the soviets, transfer complete authority to them, and help strengthen them—which is something people have been saying for a long time. Movement has begun on this path. But in many cases the euphoria of multiseat elections gave way to a struggle between party committees and soviets. This was evident at the founding congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR. Some 45% of its delegates pointed out that party organizations' relations with the renewed soviets had deteriorated. This did not escape the public's notice.

In society, particularly in the minds of communists, there is a growing belief that at the grassroots the party should restrict its intervention in economic, legal, and some other types of public activities. This is manifested in the fact that a growing number of people favor abolishing party organizations in the law-enforcement organs and depriving them of the status of political nucleus in labor collectives too. The vast majority of delegates think otherwise, however.

Party's Future Role Considered

LD0607052190 Moscow in English to North America 2208 GMT 5 Jul 90

[Report by correspondent M. Tkachenko; party officials' remarks are recorded, in Russian fading into English translation]

[Excerpts] Despite the major differences between various platforms and individual members of the Soviet Communist Party, it's likely to avoid a split in the near future. Many delegates to the current national Congress—the 28th—fear a split might add to instability in society. The conservatives and radicals have lately moved to the center by strengthening the standing of Mikhail Gorbachev.

But our special correspondent Maksim Tkachenko believes the party is yet to prove its ability to undergo a renewal and regain the leadership in perestroyka. The party is playing a hard and unusual role. With its leadership no longer enshrined in the constitution, it's handing over its many levers of power to new governing bodies both central and local. It is simultaneously losing prestige. [passage omitted]

[Tkachenko] Without a radical reform inside the party, purification and replacing the old slogans with new ones, the party will fail to improve its public image or retain its leadership of reforms that it began in 1985. In this respect its future will largely determine the future of Soviet society. Party Secretary Andrey Girenko believes the 28th congress will pull the party out of crisis:

[Begin recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] [Girenko] The party's Central Committee has been trying hard to perceive, understand, and accept the proposals on party reforms which came in during the debate on the eve of the congress. The documents presented to the congress accumulate virtually all worthy ideas expressed by supporters of various platforms.

The 28th congress was intended and organized as a congress of renewal and it must promote renewal. These hopes are questioned by many, and the recent Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of the Russian republic was overwhelmingly conservative and the delegates to that congress make up a majority of the present national forum. As delegates of a ruling party they are, above all, preoccupied with political struggle within the party, not with pulling the nation out of the crisis. [passage omitted]

Can these people carry out the reforms? A Moscow party functionary and member of the City Council, Aleksey (Grechikin), has so far seen no sign of renewal at the national Congress in which he is taking part:

[(?Grechikin)] Everyone has something to say but no one can say why the party has found itself in such a sorry state. I even do not take the economic situation or other issues of national importance into consideration. All that gives me no certainty that the party has embarked on the way of radical reform. [end recording]

Andrey Girenko, however, finds that the congress sees a trend towards compromise by various platforms. Left-wing radicals no longer threaten to step out of the congress and form a party of their own. And the conservatives no longer insist that Mikhail Gorbachev resign as the general secretary. Both gradually moved to consolidation and constructive cooperation and are groupiong around Gorbachev who suggests a moderate, pragmatic policy. Most congress delegates believe that Gorbachev must continue to hold both his presidential and his party office. Here is the view of Olzhas Suleymenov, a congress delegate from Kazakhstan and deputy of the Supreme National Legislature:

[Suleymenov] An outsider might think that the two functions cannot be performed by a single person. The example may be emulated at the lower levels of power and that could impede division of powers in republics, regions, and districts. But you cannot find a personality of Gorbachev's scope in every part of the country. That is why only Gorbachev can be trusted with such a role as an exception. If the party leadership and presidency go to different men, the conservatives could gain the upper hand in the party to put pressure on the president. That would do irrepairable damage to perestroyka.

Ryzhkov, Ligachev Inteviewed on Issues

AU0907090690 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 4 Jul 90 p 9

[Interview with Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and with Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by Vladimir Jancura and Julius Lorincz, Bratislava PRAVDA correspondents, in Moscow on 3 July: "Conversations in the Congress Lobby"]

[Text] For the journalists accredited to the 28th CPSU Congress, the intermissions between sessions are certainly most rewarding. At that time the delegates swarm out into the corridors of the Congress Palace. And among them are also the "big fish." Yesterday we managed "to catch" two members of the top party leadership.

We asked Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, mostly about problems which have not retreated into the background even at the time of the supreme congress of the Soviet communists.

[PRAVDA] Has Vilnius decided on whom it will send to the talks in Moscow?

[Ryzhkov] Not yet. We expect an answer any day now. We will decide on our representation then. Namely, we have decided to leave the initiative in the matter with Lithuania. I expect, however, that the delegations will be led by the respective premiers.

[PRAVDA] What will be the hard nut to crack at the talks?

[Ryzhkov] The first stage of the talks, when the Lithuanian government will make a definite statement regarding its preference for Lithuania to have a special status within the framework of the USSR or to secede from the Union, will probably be the most complicated one. We will decide on our further course of action according to this statement.

[PRAVDA] But Vilnius already issued an official statement that it will insist on secession....

[Ryzhkov] This is a variable concept depending on diverse conditions. Moreover, at our last meeting in Moscow Landsbergis conveyed the idea that they would once more contemplate the special status for the republic. We consider this to be a good sign. Let them think it over. During the past months they had the opportunity to experience what life outside the Soviet market is like. I asked Landsbergis how much time Lithuania will need for their products to be competitive at the more demanding world markets. Unfortunately, he did not answer. Perhaps, he did not know. I believe that it is at least 7-10 years.

[PRAVDA] At this moment in our conversation, a young delegate entered:

[Unidentified delegate] I am a miner from Makeyevka. What do you think of the resolutions by the First Congress of Miners, particularly of the strike threat?

[Ryzhkov] The government is of the opinion that to think of strikes in the present, very complex situation is altogether unacceptable. I myself am even more opposed to the idea. Listen, during the past year it has been precisely mining which took most of my time. I have been meeting mostly miners. Therefore, it is rather unpleasant now when they present me with various ultimatums, request the resignation of the government, etc.

[PRAVDA] In the meantime we were surrounded by other delegates. One of them—he introduced himself as a Donetsk Oblast sovkhoz chairman—gave the premier some indirect support:

[Sovkhoz delegate] What will happen if the farmers begin to strike as well? What will you miners eat then?

[Ryzhkov] I disagree with the claims that we did not at all keep the agreements with the miners signed during the strikes last year. After all, we raised your pensions, we are extending your vacations. There are no funds and particularly no material resources for further measures.

[Miner] You should appear on TV as soon as possible and announce what the government is up to. Yesterday, I phoned my company. People are ready to again occupy the city squares. Something must be done....

[Ryzhkov] I agree.

[PRAVDA] We met with Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, shortly after he delivered the report on his activities to the 28th congress. The delegates gave him at least the same ovations as they did to Aleksandr Yakovlev the day before yesterday. And that despite the fact that Ligachev spoke of the same issues but very differently. For instance, he repeated his well-known thesis about the priority of socialist values over the generally human ones and about the unavoidability of application of the class approach; he defended the hard anti-alcohol policy and warned against antisocialist forces as the main danger; he defended the Army and attacked the media. And we used precisely this as the point of departure for our first question.

Do you really believe that journalists are undermining the foundations of socialism in the USSR?

[Ligachev] That would be a great exaggeration. I have always enjoyed working with journalists, even with those who criticized me, because I know how difficult their work is. There are people among them, however, who should work with a greater sense of responsibility for the fate of their country, of their nation.

[PRAVDA] What do you think of the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee?

[Ligachev] Its greatest merit is, I believe, the fact that it raises truly topical questions and it even attempted to answer many of them. Perhaps the answers were not always correct or satisfactorily argued but that is another question.

[PRAVDA] Can you comment on your rumored arguments with Mikhail Gorbachev?

[Ligachev] That comes from ill-wishers who hope to build a wall of mistrust between us.

[PRAVDA] Will you fight to stay in the Politburo?

[Ligachev] No, let it be decided by the congress, by its delegates.

[PRAVDA] Should you be proposed for the post of general secretary, will you turn down the candidacy?

[Ligachev] I do not see any reason to raise such questions and embarrass Ligachev [as published]. What role will the congress assign to Gorbachev and what role to me, that is exclusively in the authority of the delegates. I will accept any decision at which they will have arrived. I am brought up that way, formed that way.

[PRAVDA] What do you think now of your biggest adversary—Boris Yeltsin?

[Ligachev] You may not believe it, but when they elected him chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR I congratulated him and wished him success. That is because now he is no longer in the opposition, and he took on a great responsibility. I hope that reason will have the better of him and that he will dedicate himself to useful work.

Abalkin Views CPSU-Supreme Soviet Relations

LD0807101190 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 0630 GMT 8 Jul 90

[Interview with USSR Deputy Premier Leonid Abalkin by J. Barath; place and date not stated; in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation—recorded]

[Text] [Barath] What can congress do and what can it not do? To this question, I was awaiting an answer from Deputy Premier Abalkin.

Can congress stop the economic reform?

[Abalkin] No, it cannot stop it.

[Barath] Many think that at the present congress the conservative spirit has triumphed. They can choose a Central Committee which could tie the hands of Gorbachev.

[Abalkin] Now I don't want to analyze in detail whether this variation is possible, that the conservatives could get the upper hand. But in a law-governed state the reforms are carried out on the basis of laws which are passed by parliament, the highest legislative body.

[Barath] But can the Supreme Soviet turn against the party?

[Abaldin] Can the CPSU turn against the Supreme Soviet, in reality this is how the question should be put since the Supreme Soviet makes decisions and gives instructions to the government, and we as part of the executive power are only accountable to the legislature. We carry out decisions of the party. The party can at most turn to the Supreme Soviet with a request if they would like the Supreme Soviet to change their decisions, but in such cases they would have to take the responsibility for constitutional conflict.

Outcome of Congress, Nation's Security Viewed

LD0707164790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1315 GMT 7 Jul 90

[Commentary by Aleksander Bovin from the "International Panorama" program]

[Excerpts] The main event of the week from the viewpoint of our domestic affairs and of world politics is of course the beginning of the 28th CPSU Congress proceedings. [passage omitted]

The conservative wave whipped up by the founders of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party is not abating. Intolerance to dissent; approaching perestroyka as the latest set of regular measures for further improvement; apparatus intrigues; persistent reluctance to abandon comforting ideological illusions—every day we can see, hear, and read variations on these subjects. And if that is the policy to be enshrined—the policy to the right of center—this means that we are to expect another wave of mess, diversions, and biding time.

I do not wish to think about this. But one must think about this to be able to fight for a different future while there is a chance to form a kind of a left-wing centrist coalition, say from Gorbachev toward the left. Another option is from Gorbachev to the right. The latter is not as viable, in my view. That would be a transitional combination which would definitely be replaced with a formula such as Polozkov's, in any direction. I have already spoken of possible consequences, and in addition there may be a disintegration of the party. Conservative circles in the party are also attacking the foreign policy of perestroyka. They suppose that it is too soft and contains too many concessions, that it prettifies imperialism. But let us approach foreign policy from the viewpoint of the end product. The end product of foreign policy is the degree of state security.

So I wish to state that never, ever in all the years of Soviet power has our country been as secure as it is today. We have no one to fear. No one is threatening us and no one intends to attack us. This opens up the way for real disarmament and therefore for converting the most developed sectors of the national economy to peaceful needs.

This said, it does not mean that the time has come to disband the Ministry of Defense or to disband the Foreign Ministry and to enjoy international peace. There is another linkage here. To enable us to feel secure in the future, both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defense must work at full speed but work in a different way—more flexibly, more subtly, and more cleverly, the more so considering that international life is raising and will raise issues which are not stereotypical but which require a speedy assessment of the situation and non-standard decisions.

Panov Cited on 'Contradicting Views' in Congress

LD0607090690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0547 GMT on 6 July broadcasts a seven minute interview with Lieutenant-General Ivan Mitrofanovich Panov, editor-in-chief of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and USSR people's deputy, by Aleksandr Ruvinskiy. Yesterday, Panov worked in the section for the renewal of the party at the CPSU congress where "contradicting views" were expressed, although the situation there was not one of conflict.

Panov says that 1,200 delegates took part in this section which reached "a coordinated point of view which on the instructions of the section will be announced at the congress today."

Panov says that "today the congress will cross the equator," and continues that the most important work will take place after the congress regarding how the mechanisms chosen at the congress operate.

In reply to a question about General Makashev, Panov thinks that his views should be publicised more widely so that the general public may understand his concerns.

Talking of Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov, Panov says that "considerable forces" in the party and society are behind Polozkov. Panov says that Polozkov cannot get away from the decisions which will be adopted at the 28th CPSU Congress and that as a result he will have to introduce "major amendments into his words and position."

Panov says in conclusion that it is not so much the adoption of decisions which is important as their implementation.

Polozkov Rejects Russian 'Conservative' Tag

LD0607170490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 6 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As you know, there are more delegates to the [28th CPSU] Congress from Russia than from anywhere else. The character and thrust of the decisions to be made by the congress will depend to a considerable extent on these delegates' votes and their positions. That is why there was definite interest among Soviet and foreign journalists in the news conference held by representatives of the Russian delegation, headed by Polozkov, who was recently elected first secretary of the Russian Communist Party. [video shows six men and one woman seated behind microphones on a stage, in a hall full of journalists and photographers. Polozkov is third from the right on the screen]

The news conference was unusual, it has to be said. It was unusual because, for what must be the first time since Comrade Polozkov was elected first secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee, he was not asked any questions about his conservatism by the journalists attending his news conference. The question is probably no longer topical. However, the conservative nature which some people ascribed to the Constituent Congress of the Russian Federation Communist Party was discussed. The journalists were interested to know what Comrade Polozkov thought of this.

[Begin Polozkov recording] There are many reasons why this evaluation has developed. One reason is that there were few representatives of different platforms and different trends. Another reason is that a large number of the delegates elected to both the first congress and the 28th congress turned out to be party officials who have lost their jobs. For some reason this is now considered to be almost harmful, as it were, to the work of our forum, although I personally simply cannot agree with this.

Yesterday, we held the first meeting of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee. The election of the membership has not been completed yet, but yesterday's meeting demonstrated that the members of the Central Committee are quite energetic people. At the very least they cannot be described as conservatives. [end recording]

Comrade Polozkov's answers to the journalists' questions showed that the leader of the Russian Communist Party realizes what an enormous mass of problems have to be resolved by the leadership of the Party, state, and government in an extremely short space of time, and that they also understand the degree of responsibility which the top leaders bear before the people.

[Begin Polozkov recording] If within two years we—and I mean the leadership of the party, the leadership of the country, and of the government—have not been able to rectify the situation, above all in the economy, then unquestionably all three leaderships will have to give up their powers. They will have to if only because we will all have to clearly understand that we will have proved ourselves quite simply bankrupt. [end recording]

Lithuania's Scant Congress Press Coverage Noted

PM0507181390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
6 Jul 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Captain 2d Class V. Gromak under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Lithuanian Press on the 28th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] Vilnius—My eye was caught by the long lines of people waiting in front of newspaper kiosks in the Lithuanian capital in the morning. I asked what people were waiting for. It turned out that many people are keen to find out what the 28th CPSU Congress materials are like. It should be borne in mind that the communist forum's work is being transmitted on All-Union Channel Two, which Lithuanian Television does not broadcast. The only source of information is the press.

Unfortunately, there are usually no central newspapers in the Lithuanian capital in the morning and, even if they do reach the kiosks, it is in limited numbers. To make up for that there is a surfeit of local and republican newspapers. What do they write? For example, EKHO LITVY in Russian on 5 July gives priority to the report that at a session of the Supreme Soviet, Lithuanian Foreign Minister A. Saudargas delivered a report on the history and politics of the United States on the occasion of American Independence Day. E. Zingeris, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission, read out a greetings letter from the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet to the congress and people of the United States. A letter from V. Landsbergis to President Bush was also read out. As for the 28th congress, there is a short report prepared from TASS materials. It is on page three.

EKHO LITVY (LIETUVOS AJDAS) offers even less information—the work of the congress is marked by a single paragraph. I shall quote it in its entirety: "The actors on the Kremlin stage are all the same. Apparently, Yegor Ligachev's speech at the 28th congress gave hope to those who are still hoping to create socialism on this earth, and not just any socialism but a very developed form. A sizeable section of the hall were already clapping in advance, looking at the soldierly tread when Ligachev walked toward the rostrum. A rostrum which has already been dubbed here the site of the political antiguillotine." And that is all. Take it any way you like. What is this—democracy? Or a distortion of it?..

Baltic Communists Send Note to Congress

LD0307182190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 3 Jul 90

[Report by correspondent Yelena Kurkletite]

[Text] Perhaps the main event today is that supplies of oil to Lithuania started again. All interrupted supplies are also being supplied and yesterday the supplies of gas were resumed. The main thing is we are working, as they told me over the telephone at the Mazeikiai oil refinery today, and the collective is now busy with the technology of starting up the refinery after two and a half months of stoppages.

Having supplies of oil makes all the inhabitants of Lithuania happy, especially the agricultural workers. Now they can be sure that they will gather this year's harvest. Otherwise, because of the absence of gasoline and lubricants recently 7,400 of the mechanics were not doing the basic work.

Of course, the moratorium recently adopted by the deputies of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet is still on the lips of the inhabitants of Lithuania. As Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiere Prunskiene said at the news confernce, the talks could start in a couple of weeks when the 28th CPSU Congress is to finish. The work of the 28th Congress also receives a big resonance among the inhabitants of Lithuania. Members of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU Platform went as delegates to the congress. Representatives of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party were not invited to the congress.

The leaders of the three Communist Parties of the Baltic republics—Ivars Kezbers, the chairman of the Independent Communist Party of Latvia; Algirdas Brazauskas, the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee; and Enn-Arno Sillari, the first secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia, on behalf of the parties they lead, have sent a message to the 28th CPSU Congress which was published in the republican press today.

It says, in particular: Creation of the independent communist parties of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was a natural result of the social processes unfolding in the Soviet Union. During the past years the objective course of events in our republics—the advance of the ideas of regional financial autonomy, economic independence, state sovereignty—were preempting the way that is now being adopted by most of the republics. The treatment of the communists of our republic who chose the independent way by the CPSU Central Committee led to the unjustified break-up of the relations between the potential allies.

The message ends with the assurance that the independent communist parties of the Baltic republics will support the aims of those democratic forces of the CPSU that are trying to break the administrative-command system's ties, to bring the humanitarian values to the first place in the scale of priorities. We think that this letter will also be read at the 28th congress.

Congress Delegates Express Views in Poll

LD0507180890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" Newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The Secretariat of the 28th CPSU Congress has circulated the results of a sociological poll of delegates. I'll give you some facts and figures that I consider interesting.

A positive assessment of the political activity of the CPSU aimed at developing democracy and striving to consolidate society upon the basis of perestroyka was given by 37 percent.

The platform of the CPSU Central Committee is supported by 49 percent and partially by 38 percent.

The Democratic Platform is supported in full by five percent and partially by 41 percent. The Marxist Platform is supported by three percent and 37 percent respectively.

The delegates gave the following replies to the question: What is your attitude to the theory of scientific socialism? It requires development and cleansing of distortions and dogmatism: 82 percent. It is completely correct: 12 percent. It is mistaken: three percent.

Eighty percent consider that the existing name of the party should be kept. Fourteen percent consider that a new name is needed.

Will the CPSU congress assist in overcoming the crisis in society? Yes replied 57 percent of delegates; 35 percent are doubtful.

Poll on Public Attitude to Congress Cited

LD0307180290 Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 3 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS—IZVESTIYA newspaper in its evening edition today carries the findings of an all-union public opinion poll about the 28th congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) by the Sociological Research Centre of the Academy of Social Sciences under the authority of the CPSU Central Committee

The poll findings revealed that 67 percent of the respondents will follow its proceedings, and 15 percent are indifferent. Only 28 percent of respondents expect that the congress will help bail society out of its crisis, with 50 percent unsure, IZVESTIYA writes.

Sociological questionnaires were also filled by 3,987 delegates to the congress. It is gratifying, the newspaper writes, the population's and delegates' evaluations of society's ills correspond to each other.

However, disputes between supporters of various political platforms threaten to eclipse the problems themselves. Sixty-two percent of the delegates said they are worried mainly by the state of affairs within the party.

In response to the question "whose interests should have priority in the elaboration of state politics?", 81 percent of delegates gave priority to human needs over the needs of nations, classes and the state.

Only eight percent of the respondents believe that party agencies can uphold the interests of the ordinary person, the newspaper notes. Local government bodies fare better: 14 percent of respondents expect that these bodies can protect people's interests.

The newspaper writes that the task of the party is to support the soviets (council), transfer all power to them and help strengthen it.

Delegates Polled on Perestroyka Crisis

LD0407103690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Today's main event, as yesterday and the day before, will be the work of the 28th CPSU Congress. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent Medvedev] So that you can get a clear picture of the speakers' positions, I think it would be interesting to tell you about the results of a sociological poll carried out here by a congress group of delegates; 85 percent took part in it, in effect a decisive majority. What were the principal questions? Where do you see the causes of the crisis in society during the period of perestroyka? A key question, you will agree; 44 percent replied that it was a lack of clear theoretical guidelines in the development of society, just under 40 percent of the delegates said that it was the half-hearted nature of the economic reform, and 38 percent described slowness in making decisions as one of the main causes.

Another key question, one of the main ones, I think: How would you assess the possible consequences of implementing the program presented by the government for extricating the country from crisis? Fifty-two percent of the delegates said that the program was half-hearted, 25 percent said it will lead to chaos, and only 11 percent of the total said that this program could radically improve the economy. [passage omitted]